

Obama: Helping Terror Go Nuclear

Last Tuesday's terror attack on a Jerusalem synagogue killed five people: four rabbis (including three born in the USA) and a Druze police officer. Two Palestinians entered during morning prayers and attacked worshippers with knives, meat cleavers and a handgun. Congress showed moral clarity when blaming the horrors on Hamas and Palestinian Authority incitement, but Obama's statements were perfunctorily "balanced." Obama warned of a "spiral" of violence—an obtuse refrain of those suggesting moral equivalency between terrorism and the fight against it. Obama also misleadingly claimed that "President Abbas ... strongly condemned the attacks," omitting that Abbas did so only after pressure from the administration and with equivocation. (Abbas suggested a link between recent terrorism and visits by Jews to the Temple Mount, as if to justify the attacks.) It's also worth noting that Palestinians celebrated the massacre (as they did after the 2013 Boston bombing and the 9/11 attacks).

Obama's weak reaction is consistent with his mostly impotent response to ISIS terrorists who behead Americans and Mideast Christians and grow their Islamist empire by the day. Frighteningly, his approach to Iranian nukes follows the same meek pattern, but the stakes are exponentially higher, because when Iran goes nuclear, so does terrorism.

Iran is already the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, without nuclear weapons. Iran-supported Hamas has already tried to commit nuclear terror: Last summer, Hamas launched rockets at Israel's Dimona nuclear reactor. How much more dangerous will Iran become when it has nukes? Even if Iran doesn't directly commit nuclear terrorism, an Iranian nuclear umbrella will embolden the regime and the terrorist organizations it sponsors.

Obama has a long record of weakness towards Iran. In 2009, when Iran's Basij paramilitary force brutalized demonstrators protesting Iran's fraudulent presidential election, Obama kept his response irrelevantly mild for the sake of "engaging" Iran. That surely helped Iranian voters understand the risks of protesting the "free" election of 2012 (involving eight regime-picked candidates). It was indeed a very orderly rubberstamp.

In 2011, when a U.S. drone went down on Iranian soil, Obama cordially requested it back. The regime recently scoffed at such impotence by showcasing its knock-off based on that drone.

President Hassan Rouhani's election vastly improved the public face of Iran's nuclear program, and Obama was charmed too. Obama has been unilaterally weakening the sanctions against Iran by not enforcing them. He has threatened to thwart any Congressional attempt to limit his nuclear generosity by simply lifting sanctions without Congressional approval. Yet despite these concessions and Rouhani's smiles, human rights abuses in Iran have actually worsened.

Obama declared in 2012 (while running for reelection) that he doesn't bluff when it comes to stopping Iranian nukes, and that containment was not an option, unlike military force. But the credibility of that statement collapsed after Obama shrunk away from his "red line" against Syrian chemical weapons use. In 2013, Basher Assad gassed his own people and Obama took no military action. So if Obama cowers against a disintegrating state, what are the chances that he'll militarily prevent Iranian nukes?

And Obama has dangerously undermined the only military threat to Iranian nukes that anyone still takes seriously: Israel. On the Iranian nuclear issue, Obama has isolated Israel on how close Iran is to a nuclear capability with estimates that are

far laxer. And as long as Obama continues negotiating (even if Iran is clearly playing for time as the U.S. offers ever more desperate proposals) or reaches a deal allowing Iran to become a threshold nuclear weapons state, an Israeli military option to defang Iranian nukes appears less legitimate.

The media's anti-Israel bias is well known (they can't even get a simple story about vehicular terrorism against Israelis correct (compare how *The Guardian* writes accurate headlines when Canada suffers an Islamist car attack but not when Israel does). So if Obama accepts Iran's nuclear program and Israel then attacks it, the media will be even harsher on Israel (even though the world will be silently relieved, if Israeli courage succeeds at neutralizing what scared everyone else).

Downgrading relations seems to be part of Obama's détente with Iran. Iran's Supreme Leader Khamenei recently tweeted his plan for destroying Israel, but Obama grows even more to reach an accord that legitimizes Iran's nuclear program. And the Obama administration's diplomatic abuse of America's closest Mideast ally is unprecedented—from his humiliation of Prime Minister Netanyahu in 2010 to Secretary of State John Kerry's betrayal of Israel during Operation Protective Edge, to calling Netanyahu a “(expletive)” a few weeks ago, without even apologizing later (note the irony of calling Netanyahu a coward anonymously). Obama seems far more concerned by Israeli construction of apartments in Jerusalem than a nuclear Iran. And he has been pressuring Israel to retreat from more disputed territory, effectively rewarding Palestinians for launching the third missile war against Israel from Gaza in five years last summer and now the third Intifadah inside Israel in 17 years. That puts Obama just behind the European appeasers who think Palestinian bellicosity merits statehood.

Obama indeed appears desperate to get a nuclear accord with Iran at any price. He has written letters asking for Iran's help against ISIS after they hinted at an ISIS-for-nukes exchange, and has pursued an agreement at all costs. Obama's

top aide, Ben Rhodes, was caught saying how a nuclear accord is as important to Obama as “healthcare”; at least there’s a fitting slogan to sell the deal to Americans: “If you like your nukes, you can keep them.”

Russia, the serial spoiler, suggested extending nuclear talks past the November 24th deadline. Iran will undoubtedly agree to more enrichment time (while it keeps stonewalling the IAEA’s investigations into its nukes), as it did last July. For Obama, a bad agreement or an extension looks far better than concluding that talks have failed and issuing more empty threats to stop Iran militarily. And so U.S. foreign policy will continue its freefall, as the world’s bad actors will want to see what they can extort from a leader even weaker than President Carter. While Carter permitted Iran to hold 52 American diplomats and citizens hostage for 444 days, Obama may allow Iran to hold the world hostage with nuclear terrorism. It’s now dreadfully obvious: Without massive public pressure, Obama will help Iran get nukes; anyone concerned about nuclear terrorism should sign this petition:

Noah Beck *is the author of The Last Israelis, an apocalyptic novel about Iranian nukes and other geopolitical issues in the Middle East.*