IRAN AND CONGRESS: It's a chicken and egg thing!





Here's what provoked me:

An editorial presented a position with which I mostly agree, but the way it was presented, invited an argument in opposition. I submitted my opinion on what would have made the editorial a more convincing and powerful presentation.

Here's my response:

Iran and Congress: It's a chicken and egg thing!

Senator Corker (R-Tenn) introduced legislation to give a voice to congress in any nuclear agreement with Iran. I agree with the central message of the April 20 editorial, that Corker's proposal brings much needed "order to the process." It also has veto-proof bipartisan support, which has forced the President to acquiesce.

The opposing view from Majal Abdi considers this an effort to undermine the President's negotiation authority, and changes the rules regarding the President's right to "waive sanctions" - and it "would kill a deal."

The editorial fails to emphasize, and Abdi's opposing view completely ignores, what really motivated Corker's proposal, as well as the impetuous and recent unhelpful action by the 47 senators – i.e. what really came first in this power struggle between Congress and Obama?

The easy answer is that while of course the President has exclusive Constitutional authority to negotiate treaties, it is the responsibility of the Senate to approve any agreement before it is enforceable as a treaty. And there's the rub!

Obama had given every indication that he would bypass Congressional approval and present the final agreement to the United Nations. It's this rascal President's attempt at a power grab that started the entire exchange!