

## **The Current Iran Nuclear Accord--- A Losers Bet**

By Sam D. Timpano

The signatories to the Iran Nuclear Accord in the jargon of gambling took the greatest risk only the most addicted gambler at the table would take.

It was what is known as an “*all in losers bet*”.

The difference between that kind of bet in a casino and what these signatories did was instead of just money at risk they bet the stability of the Region and the world and the lives of every single human on the planet.

Why do addicted gamblers do that? What is the psychology of that kind of auto-destructive thinking?

Why do addicted gamblers keep betting, sometimes increasing their bets despite losing?

And finally, why do addicted gamblers ultimately ignore the realities of what is happening to their lives because of gambling and continue in the same behavior?

Studies by Cambridge University confirm some of the reasons which I will come back to later in this paper.

Shifting from casinos to geopolitics and to get on point with current events, it is necessary to look at what the situation with Iran and its nuclear program were leading up to the signing of the accord.

The Iran Nuclear Deal as it is known was signed on November 24, 2013 in Switzerland by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany (referred to as P5 +1) and was announced amidst great fanfare worldwide of euphoric leaders as the ending of Iran’s nuclear program and ensuring the world that Iran will never become a nuclear power.

Some people, especially those who were more experienced and therefore skeptical of the agreement and Iranian leadership continually warned that the deal would actually enable Iran more than deter their program and could actually end up with Iran finally becoming a nuclear power capable of accomplishing a nuclear strike.

One of the loudest and most adamant voices against this deal was that of the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, who in a last attempt to stop the deal made an appeal before the Congress of the United States, only to fall on deaf ears of the administration.

The deal was signed and most of the sanctions imposed on Iran were lifted and billions of dollars were released to Iran as a result.

After four years, Iran's nuclear program has virtually disappeared from the headlines, the world has basically forgotten that Iran had a nuclear program and ignores the realities of Iran's leadership and continued support of terrorist organizations, participation in Syria and most importantly, for the larger part of the world, have not paid any attention to the stated long term goals of Iran's leadership and their view of the Region and the world.

One country, has however continued to monitor Iran and for self-survival reasons has continued to conduct overt and covert operations to detect any and all progress by Iran with its nuclear program and to know if and when Iran fails to stick to the terms of the agreement.

That country is Israel and the Prime Minister disclosed a part of what Israel has uncovered to the entire world with regards to the status of Iranian adherence to the accord and a portion of Iranian planning for the future of their nuclear program.

For some, his presentation is being treated as little more than ho-hum politics as usual by Israel and especially Netanyahu and some agencies that were key to the agreement indicating that everything he disclosed was already known by those agencies.

Some others, like President Trump, who has always believed that the agreement was worthless and has to decide if the United States will remain a part of the original agreement or if he will take the US out of the agreement and request new negotiations to work towards a more meaningful and secure agreement with Iran, Netanyahu's presentation has served as confirmation of what many have suspected all along.

Iran never had any intentions of dismantling or abandoning its' nuclear program and everything that was agreed to in the accords were worth less than the paper the document was composed on.

Gaining a nuclear capability is the key to Iran securing once and for all its' dominance of the Middle East and to the furthering of their overall plan with regards to Israel and the West. Plans that are less than peaceful and far from any establishment of order and peace in the Region.

President Trump is supposed to make the decision on May 12<sup>th</sup> and one can only expect that he will withdraw the United States from the agreement and push for the kinds of inspections and due diligence in Iran that were never done leading up to the signing of the current agreement and most likely will reinstate some or all of the US sanctions on Iran that were in place prior to the signing of the current agreement.

Shifting back to the jargon of gambling and addicted gamblers, what does that mean?

First of all, it is a step towards taking away the "house advantage" or changing the odds.

It is also a first step of breaking the destructive cycle of the addicted gambler.

The studies by Cambridge University referred to at the beginning of this paper produces some very important insights into addicted gambling and gamblers.

I will outline several here that are, I believe relevant to how the current agreement ended up being signed and why President Trump needs to take the decision to pull out of the agreement and push for a new agreement.

The gambler and in particular the addicted gambler has a singular focus and that is to win more than he loses and is prepared at times to risk it all (the “all in” bet) when he is either convinced of having the winning hand or when he is desperate and has already lost almost all he has.

Shifting back to Obama and John Kerry on this particular accord, in the last portion of his final term of office, Obama was desperately seeking an issue or several issues around which he could structure his legacy.

He was facing the end of eight years of what was being seen by some as the worst administration since Jimmy Carter held the office and what history will eventually judge to be one of the most divisive and destructive administrations of modern US history.

He had no real legacy to point to and not much in hand that could be seen as developable into a legacy of any meaningful issue.

The nation had become more divided in terms of society and race than it had been leading up to the Civil Rights movement and in economic terms was struggling to reach any kind of meaningful growth levels or job creation.

A US ambassador was murdered along with four other Americans in Lebanon with both he and his Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton fabricating false news reports to cover up the truth and the final blow to the families of these murdered men and all Americans, Hillary Clinton making the statement in her addresses to Congress of “what difference does it make” that for many Americans will forever be part of any conversation about negligence and dereliction of duty with either Hillary or Obama included as prime examples.

Early and unadvised withdrawing from Iraq led to chaos there as well as in Afghanistan. His famous “red line” with Asaad in Syria became the fodder for international snickering at the virtually meaningless and toothless response to both Asaad and Putin’s thumbing their noses at him and his red line.

The US military had been reduced to levels that have not been seen since before World War II and most of the military were left in dire straits in terms of budget and even having spare parts for a substantial part of the entire force.

It was clearly known by all the major powers worldwide that the US could not manage to defend or provide any meaningful offensive push in multiple global theatres of operations if required.

Internationally, due to the eight years of “leading from behind” the United States had lost all initiatives in terms of stability in the Middle East and international terrorism took a staggering

toll on all of the world in terms of innocent lives being lost and monumental costs to try and control it.

The birth and rapid expansion of ISIS lays totally on Obama's doorstep due to his "second team" belief of what that organization actually represented in terms of being a real threat and the after effects of that view are still being felt today around the world.

So, in gambling terms he was down to his last hand with virtually no real advantage in his hand at being able to leave office with a legacy other than failures on every front to leave behind.

One issue that he felt would form part of his legacy and was desperate to defend and see continued of course was his healthcare plan (Obamacare) which was seen by many experts as a failed policy almost from the inception and at the period leading up to his departure from the White House many experts could see that it was a virtual black hole and an incredibly destructive policy to both the healthcare situation in the US as well as a major and increasing liability in economic terms both for the federal budget as well as for most of middle class American workers and their families.

Costs were occurring at geometrical rates in some areas and one State after another was either reducing or cancelling the program altogether. Most of the insurance companies involved were withdrawing from the pools in most of the States and Americans were finding more and more defects in their plans and many were experiencing less to zero coverage for many of the treatments that they and their families needed.

In terms of geopolitics, he had virtually no major accomplishments to point to other than perhaps having found and killed Bin Laden, despite all the efforts in various regions of the world to get to something meaningful.

Two very hot topics were on the minds of most of the world as his second term was drawing to a close, climate change and Iran's nuclear program and Obama and his team determined that those two issues could form the basis of a lasting legacy.

These two issues formed the Obama "*all in*" bet to win a legacy.

But, rather than take the lead on these issues, he determined to stick with what had been a losing strategy all during his eight years in office which was letting international organizations and other nations determine policies on these types of issues and then signing America onto those policies in collaboration with those groups.

And so, the European Union established the basic agreements on both of these issues and Obama tried to show that America was party to those agreements and leading on their implementation but the reality was totally contrary.

Both of those accords were initiated by France and Germany mostly and they pushed them up to become EU accords with the US having little to do with the main portions of those agreements.

The signing of the climate accord, known as the Paris Accord on Climate Change was done practically with little thought or consideration of what the accord meant in economic terms for the country and just what the various clauses in the accord meant for job creation and indeed, this one accord became a major block to many infrastructure initiatives and as was ultimately the case, a destructive force to existing employment and new job creation.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement was seen by many as perhaps one of the worst and most one sided agreements between nations and in particular with rogue governments that was ever negotiated.

President Trump identified it as such and since his inauguration has been developing plans to extract the US from the accord.

Primarily, the accord had little to no oversight portions to it and instead, was basically an agreement that simply provided that Iran would adhere to the agreements and that all the information leading up to the agreement provided by Iran was accurate and truthful.

In addition to these particular failures in the agreement, the US released more than five billion dollars of frozen funds back to Iran with no requirements for inspections in Iran, no conditions or partial releases based on any kind of verification of the data provided by Iran prior to the signing or into the future after the agreement was signed leaving the agreement totally dependent on Iran keeping its' word and only providing periodic and scanty details as the clock for the agreements' termination ticked down, a term of ten years.

Gamblers only risk money whereas leaders of nations who make "all in" bets like this are placing millions of lives and in this particular case, the future existence of nations (especially Israel) on the table without having any idea of what the other side of the bet has in their hands or how they intend to play.

With the recent revelations by Israel it is not too difficult to understand just how much of an "all in" bet Obama and the rest of the world has been making on this particular hand.

It is clear that Iran lied at every stage of the negotiations leading up to the agreement and indeed never had any intention to abandon its' drive to a nuclear capability. Nor should anyone with any level of understanding of the leadership of Iran and their planning both in regional terms as well as long term on a global basis have expected anything less.

Iran's intermediate goals are as clearly stated as anyone would need to understand just how dangerous a regime is in control of that country.

This is not something new. In fact, it goes back centuries of history of the Middle East and is tied directly to the radical theological beliefs of the regime that in the end positions Iran as the center

of the world and in control of all societies and the elimination of Israel and an eventual Armageddon in order to usher in the return of the thirteenth Iman to rule the world until its' end.

One can shrug that off and view all this as just a player bluffing and trying to force everyone to drop out of the game and leave them with all the money in the pot but professional gamblers always look for some means to understand the other players so that they don't get bluffed out of the game and to know when they might have an advantage and it is very close to the same in geopolitical negotiations of this sort, especially when the stakes are as high as they are in this particular issue.

So, let's back away from the gambling table and understand the next steps we can expect to see from President Trump and equally or even more importantly, Israel.

President Trump has decried these two agreements from the time the negotiations were being held regarding them, up to and including the present time, and were a major focus of his campaign and has continued to be since taking office.

On the Paris Accords he has indicated that he will extract the US from those accords during the campaign and indeed, after taking office he has withdrawn the US from those accords.

Prior to the revelations by Israel he was also reviewing the US exiting the Iran Nuclear Agreement and re-imposing sanctions on Iran and it would seem now that with the revelations by Israel regarding Iran's deception and future plans for achieving a nuclear capacity that he will most assuredly withdraw from the Agreement and impose new sanctions on Iran.

While this is an important development, the more important consideration is what will Israel do at this point?

Israel could actually cause America to show its' hand on this issue by moving forward with a unilateral action plan to destroy any Iranian hope of gaining a nuclear capability and from recent statements Prime Minister Netanyahu has made in Israel and to the rest of the world, he is willing to do exactly that and go "all in" on this issue.

If Israel actually makes the determination to act, it will be in concert with some level of understanding with the US and it could also turn out to be a well announced collaboration with most likely some level of collaboration from the UK, possibly France and most assuredly the Saudi's in one way or another.

There is almost little choice at this point other than to take an action either in some sort of a coalition with the US and other nations, certainly the US or go it alone because the future existence of Israel is on the table and has been practically since the Ayatollahs took control of Iran in the 1970's.

The rest of the free world would be foolish and irresponsible if the leaders try and ignore the details Israel has released and fall back to some sort of false narrative that there is not enough evidence in these facts to justify withdrawing from the existing agreement and forcing Iran into a new agreement that has sufficient safeguards and independent scheduled and unannounced inspections to verify compliance.

Despite the general reluctance in hard negotiations and confronting rogue nations and leaders that permeates most of the governments of the world these days, there are some gambles that just have too high of a cost if you bet wrong and this is one of them.

President Trump will do well to pull out of the existing agreement and push hard for a new one with or without any other participant to the accord supporting him for a new agreement and withdrawing as well if Iran resists.

What action would follow if Iran resists or refuses to negotiate a new agreement?

That is a subject for the next hand to be dealt but at this point it should not be and for both President Trump and Israel it would not be a bluff and Iran should understand that and for certain Vladimir Putin will understand it and just as with North Korea, China helped Kim understand the game he was in and the danger he was facing, Putin will, if he is the card player he really is get that point across to the Ayatollahs in Tehran and we will find them fold and negotiate a new agreement.

No matter what, for the US and Israel at least it would not be an “all in” loser bet but it would be for Iran and they will not risk that.

What was needed in the original negotiations and is now at the table were leaders like President Trump and Prime Minister Netanyahu dealing the cards and establishing the stakes.