

IRAN NUCLEAR STEAL

Iran Nuclear Deal is a bad deal for the United States as it arms our greatest enemy in the Middle East.



Cade Palmer
Copy Editor

“Death to America! Death to Israel!”

Those were the chants that rang through the streets of Iran as the United States made major concessions with regard to our nuclear policy towards the country. A policy that has kept Iran from acquiring nuclear and ballistic missiles for over a decade.

Instead of continuing the successful policy until Iran makes some common sense

concessions, like perhaps freeing the three American journalists currently imprisoned by the country, the United States has done exactly the opposite and perhaps funded the terror and nuclear programs that Iran harbors.

We begin first with the deal itself. Perhaps the biggest point of contingency is the fact that the deal will result in the allocation of somewhere in the ballpark of \$150 billion to that Iranian government. This money can be spent however the government of Iran sees

fit. Keep in mind that Iran is designated as a State Sponsor of Terrorism by the United States Department of State, meaning they literally have funded terrorism in the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and Latin America. As the United States essentially hands Iran this money, we can only hope that our President's confidence that Iran will do the right thing holds true.

Another portion of the Iran Nuclear Deal that has caused concern among lawmakers and citizens is the ability of Iran to investigate their own nuclear sites weapons. As laid out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in a leaked agreement entitled “separate arrangement II,” Iran will have the ability to investigate their own equipment of their facilities with their own experts for evidence of the development of nuclear weapons.

Another portion of the released separate arrangement reads as following “Iran is to provide agency experts with photos and videos of locations the IAEA says are linked to the alleged weapons work, ‘taking into account military concerns.’” This basically means that Iran will not even have to provide photos and videos of the areas that IAEA hopes to view if they deem them as militarily significant.

This previous one example of a secret agreement between

the IAEA and Iran with regard to the nuclear deal. The Obama administration, confident in the IAEA's ability to investigate the military ramifications of the deal has, by choice, denied the opportunity to possess these so deemed “side deals.” Additionally, under oспics that such agreements are normally confidential, refused to provide the details of IAEA-Iran deal to the members of congress who are meant to vote on the legitimacy of the deal.

Besides the fact that the deal itself is inherently flawed, the process of voting on the bill and the things that have happened during and after the negotiations have been the cause of much apprehension. It began with the highest ranking Iranian official shouting for the end of our country and its greatest ally, which always a great omen of peace and understanding. Particularly coming from the country we are trusting to engage only nuclear energy formation. That same man was quoted saying that Israel will not see the end of these next 25 years. Sounds like the man we should allow to develop “peaceful” nuclear energy.

Furthermore, this quote by Iran's legal advisor during the negotiations, Dr. Saberi Ansari, is particularly troublesome, “This is neither an agreement nor a treaty. An agreement or a treaty is distinguished by the fact that its contents

are binding on contracting parties.” Essentially, Iran's top legal advisor doesn't believe the restrictions of the deal are mandatory.

The way in which the deal has been forced upon the people of the U.S. is quite corrupt as well. First, the President has sought to over step his power allocated to the office by refusing to call the agreement a treaty, which it is. Republicans in Congress have tried to combat this by passing a bill that would end the deal. However, by doing this Obama has turned the tables. The administration already made clear that it will veto the measure meant to tank the bill. Now instead of requiring the Constitutionally mandated 67 Senate votes to ratify the treaty, the Congress must have enough dissenters in both house to overturn a Presidential veto. To sustain the such, Obama needs 34 votes in the Senate and 145 in the House. The measure will likely be fail, via presidential veto, and the Iran deal enacted.


Furthermore, President Obama, immediately following the agreement, took the deal to the United Nations Security Council where it was unanimously approved. This comes as no surprise, though, as the council is made of nations ranging from China, Russia, to European countries who look to make a small fortune on arms deals now that Iran will have billions of dollars in pocket change. Yet Obama took the deal to the council, who by the way has no impact whatsoever on United States foreign policy, simply to stick it to Republicans who he knew would oppose the deal.

As a result, the deal has no intrinsic value for the U.S. It gives a means towards nuclear development to a state sponsor of terrorism, an enemy of our own country and our greatest ally. We are making a deal with a country that has it's own holiday to scream to “Death to America” in the streets. More so, much of our legislators really have no idea what was actually negotiated during the deal due to its confidentiality. Our legislators should stand up for our nation and reject the corrupt and horrendous deal.

Republican Student Poll


Following the first two debates, Republican students poll the candidates.

Cade Palmer
Copy Editor




Dr. Ben Carson 34%

A pediatric nuerosurgeon who rose to the political spotlight when he ripped Obamacare to Obama's face, on national television.




Carly Fiorina 24%

Once the CEO of Hewlett-Packard, Fiorina has rose quick in the polls after her stellar performance in the first two debates. A probusiness candidate, she appeals to mcuch of the conservative base.




Donald Trump 15%

The real-estate mogul, and most successful businessman in the race. Trump shot in the polls intially but enthusiasm has started to wane. Trump is very tough on immigration and known for telling it like it is.




Ted Cruz 9%

The die hard conservative freshman senator who grew to prominence after filibustering for over 21 hours on the floor against Obamacare. He's a slightly less abrasive Donald Trump type candidate.




Marco Rubio 6%

This junior Flordia sentor enjoys the support of some of the more moderate Republicans though he has earned a reputation as a strong conservative candidate.




Chris Christie 5%

The New Jersey Governor who started out as a hard liner but suddenly fell from the conservative graces after a hug with Obama. Since several scandals have plagued his administration



Dr. Rand Paul 5%

The opthalmolotrist turned senator who is the most libertarian candidate in the Republican party. As the son of once senator Ron Paul, he has name recognition and strong student base.



Jeb Bush 2%

Surprise! Another Bush is entering the presidential race. Jeb is the oldest son of George H. W. Bush and as such has raised tremendous amounts of money from his brother and father's donors. Bush is more moderate candidate.

Candidates recieving no votes: Lindsey Graham, Mike Huckabee, Bobby Jindal, John Kasich, George Pataki, Rick Santorum.

No Neutral Net

Net Neutrality set to limit amount and cost of internet streaming

Eddie Kennedy
Photo Editor

With elections coming up,= soon many controversial ideas will be brought into question by the candidates running. One issue that might not be brought to light, but should be is net neutrality.

Net neutrality is a conflict between the consumer and the corporations. Corporations feel that since they provide a service to consumers, they should be able to decide what they provide, much like a cable company. If you want to be able to access Netflix, it will cost you \$5 more a month, plus the netflix subscription.

Consumers see the internet as an open source of service. This case was debated in 2014 in the case of Verizon Communications vs. the Federal Communications Commission. In which one of the main points

that Verizon brought was the fact that many streaming websites like Youtube, Netflix, and Hulu made a huge load on the bandwidth of their servers. They proposed that these companies paid the ISPs for

“Net neutrality is one of the craziest ideas I've ever heard.”
-Jeb Bush

a faster access way for their customers to stream videos, TV shows and movies.

Of course that would mean the monthly cost for all of these other services would increase. The supreme court ruled that the internet be classified as a utility like water or electricity, meaning that internet access can not be limited from parts that the internet service providers see as costly or against what they believe in or what they want their customers to not, i.e. a rival company.

Now knowing this you might think, well this doesn't matter anymore, the Supreme Court made a decision and it's over. Elections are coming up soon.

What might be an issue that these new candidates will be faced with? Jeb Bush has already said that net neutrality hurts the corporate sector.

“Net neutrality is one of the craziest ideas I've ever heard,” Jeb Bush said. “Company's know what is best,” according to an interview conducted by engadget.

The next big issue is about the proposed bill the FCC wrote. The act was brought into question and is more than likely going to be repealed. The ISP's will have much more power on their service.

Net Neutrality isn't just an issue that will influence how people consume media and how much it will cost, but what will be shown to people. The only people that will argue against net neutrality are the capitalist businessmen wanting the power to control what people will be allowed to see and align their information to only promote their own personal agenda.