

Nearly 200 Former Generals and Admirals Sign Letter Opposing Iran Nuke Deal



Former Marine Commandant Gen. Charles Krulak

Nearly 200 former generals and admirals signed a letter sent to Congress rejecting the Obama nuclear pact with Iran. Many general and flag officers served under both Democratic and Republican Administrations. Among them are former Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence under President Bush [Gen. William "Jerry" Boykin](#), USAF Lt. [Gen. Tom McInerney](#) and former [Marine Commandant Gen. Charles Krulak](#). The letter addressed to both House and Senate Republican and Democratic leaders rebuts one sent a week ago by 33 generals and admirals supporting the President's nuclear deal with Iran. We hope that [Gen. Barry McCaffrey](#) signed up given his rejection of the opportunity to support the Iran deal. According to the [Washington Post \(WP\)](#):

The letter faulted the JCPOA for not cutting off "every pathway" Iran has to develop nuclear weapons, as well as for allowing Tehran to benefit from billions in sanctions relief, which may be used to "continue to support terrorism in Israel, throughout the Middle East and globally, whether directly or through proxies."

The full text of the letter can be found on the *WP* [website](#):

It concluded:

This agreement will enable Iran to become far more dangerous, render the Mideast still more unstable and introduce new threats to

American interests as well as our allies.

The *WP* noted comments from retired Lt. Gen. Thomas McInerney, former vice commander of US Air Forces in Europe:

He considers the agreement the most dangerous nuclear accord in U.S. history.

"What I don't like about this is, the number one leading radical Islamic group in the world is the Iranians," he said. "They are purveyors of radical Islam throughout the region and throughout the world. And we are going to enable them to get nuclear weapons. Why would we do that?"

McInerney said he thinks that most retired general officers do not support the agreement, but he said some did not sign the letter because they feared negative career repercussions.

"I don't think the retired general officers necessarily speak with one voice," he said. "We've all gone our own way when we retired."

Note what the *Washington Post* [reported](#) about author of this letter and his motivation to get it circulated:

Leon A. "Bud" Edney, a retired admiral who served as vice chief of naval operations, initiated the letter after he read the letter by other retired officers in support of the agreement.

"I looked at the letter they published, and thought it was very weak," Edney said. "I just don't agree with it." He then got the alternative viewpoint rolling through e-mails sent to some of his Navy and Marine friends. They in turn passed it on.

The *Tower* [reported](#):

Earlier this month, retired general Charles Krulak, the former commandant of the Marine Corps, commented that out

of the many retired officers who could have signed the letter supporting the deal, “only 30+ could be found to do so.”

Speaking before the Birmingham, Alabama Jewish Federation in mid-August Gen Krulak [said](#):

I don't think there is much value in repeating that rationale other than to say that we went into this process with specific goals as a baseline and came out with many of those goals either partially achieved or not achieved at all. Even those partially achieved are, at the end of the day, dependent on Iran acting like a trustworthy member of the world community. I am unable to bet the safety of my Country or the State of Israel or any other country for that matter on the trustworthiness of Iran. In all fairness, there are others who disagree and do so with great passion and belief in their point of view. I respect their beliefs and do not, for a minute, minimize them. ...

At the same time, I am very concerned that not enough focus is being placed on what I would call “the day after tomorrow” if the JCPOA is adopted. What steps will be taken, at the strategic level, to safeguard our Nation and the State of Israel beyond all the supposed safeguards found in the JCPOA? What are the unintended consequences of the JCPOA on the Nations within the region? What can we reasonably expect to happen as new oil begins to flow from well heads in Iran? Or when sanctions are lifted and billions of dollars flow into the coffers of the largest exporter of terrorism in the world? Or when weapons are sold on the open market? Or when other countries, concerned about the potential of a nuclear Iran, start their own programs?

The Tower [noted](#) other veterans forming groups to reject the Iran nuclear deal:

A number of Iraq war veterans recently formed a group to

oppose the JCPOA. Michael Pregent, the executive director of the group, Veterans Against the Deal, said, "Our main argument is that veterans know Iran better than Washington, D.C., does. You've got a lot of veterans out there who are pretty upset about this, so we are looking to capture their voices and make sure they are heard."