THE REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE

NATIONAL SECURITY WORKING GROUP
Rep. Trent Franks, Chairman

202.226.9717
rsc.scalise.house.gov

Dec. 11, 2013

The National Security Working Group (NSWG) provides wide-spectrum coverage of issues like the Iranian threat, missile defense, sequestration, New START, events in Syria and more. We look forward to providing this newsletter to RSC members and welcome your input throughout the 113th Congress.

Iran Theat: Hagel pitches Missile Defense, Kerry pitches "delicate" approach (Rep. Franks)

The current line from this administration seems to be: we should recognize Iran as a threat, but we should also believe them when they say they'll never take that threat to the nuclear level.

During his whirlwind trip through the gulf, U.S. Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel visited with Saudi officials – among others – to discuss U.S. missile defense sales to the Gulf Cooperation Council, so the six member nations can have more coordinated radars, sensors and early warning missile defense systems.

In a press conference Hagel said, "I know that Iran's nuclear program is only one dimension of the threats Iran poses in the region. I'm briefed virtually every day about these threats. That's why we remain committed to ballistic missile defense for our partners here in the region and for Europe."

Apparently, recognizing a certain inevitability of danger from Iran is acceptable to the administration when negotiating with Gulf States for missile defense sales, but forcing Iran to own their track record of failed negotiations and ignored international agreements on nuclear development isn't kosher.

The most pertinent question is; **why** would Iran stop short of being a nuclear threat?

Many would argue it is the suffocating sanctions imposed upon Iran that have finally brought the country to the negotiating table. However, the President is now saying the likelihood of a final deal with Iran is "less than 50/50." And some experts have gone on the record saying Iran could be nuclear-weapons capable within 30 days.

Yesterday Secretary Kerry made his argument about why it is time for "delicate" negotiations with Iran. "This is a very delicate diplomatic moment …we're at a crossroads. One path could lead to an enduring resolution in the international community's concerns about Iran's nuclear program. The other path could lead to continued hostility and potentially to conflict."

If this were true, and "delicate" hand-holding is all it takes to reduce the prevalence of violence from Iran, then why would our European partners need further missile defense infrastructure?

The truth is **no amount** of delicacy from the United States will influence Iran to abandon violent aims, nuclear or otherwise. Our administration, and our Gulf partners, knows this. Iran has taken zero actions to support the assumption that they would stop short of achieving the nuclear edge in that region. If we believe Iran is threat a to its neighbors, requiring an "indelicate" solution such as missile defense, why would they stop short of achieving a nuclear weapon that would trump such defenses?

NSWG Contact: Ari Zimmerman, Ari.Zimmerman@mail.house.gov, 6-5536

Each NSWG Item reflects the position and view of the authoring office. Questions or comments regarding the NSWG can be directed to: Jackie Rivera, Jackie.Rivera@mail.house.gov or 6-0678