

**IRAN AND ITS NUCLEAR AMBITIONS:  
CAN THERE, EVER, BE  
A COMPREHENSIVE, ENDURING AGREEMENT ?**

As the days creep closer to the end of March when the latest round of talks between The United States of America and The Islamic Republic of Iran over Iran's nuclear programme, everybody and his cat – especially Israeli cats, known in some quarters as Sabra Cats – wait and watch in order to ascertain how Iran will be able to prolong the nuclear talks to a date ... in the far-distant future.

Few people believe that Iran would be willing to agree to what it maintains are draconian measures, set forth for acceptance to be imposed on the country, those measures, aimed at limiting Iran's ability to obtain matériel in order to enable the country to have far-reaching nuclear capabilities.

The United States is concerned that Iran wants to build up a nuclear arsenal.

Israel is certain that that is Iran's purpose in stockpiling strategic materials that have the ability to assist in the creation of producing weapons of mass destruction.

Many other countries vehemently believe that Iran's true intent with regard to its nuclear programme is that of becoming a dominant nuclear power in the Middle East.

If this proves to be the case, it is likely to spur other Middle Eastern countries to follow suit: Sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

It is well accepted that nearly all children, being given a new toy with which to play, will immediately want to know how it works and *'What would happen if this or that is done to the new toy?'*

The latest incident that must have been a shock to the powers-that-be in Tehran, the Capital City of Iran, are the rather interesting results of this week's democratic elections in Israel, with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's Likud Party, capturing 30 seats in the Knesset out of the 120 seats.

The Likud Party, therefore, continues as the dominant political force in the Jewish State, with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu firmly in the driver's seat.

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu only recently flew to Washington D.C. in order to try to persuade The United States not to come into an agreement with Tehran over its nuclear programme.

The Israeli election results must have been somewhat of a surprise to Iran's Government because it was widely presumed that a more conciliatory political party, one with which Iran could discuss certain matters, would unseat the Likud Party.

But it was not to be.

Prior to this Israeli elections, another potential stumbling block in the two-year saga in trying to reach a consensus on various aspects of the nuclear talks, being held between The United States and Iran, is, as far as President Hassan Fereidun Rouhani is concerned, the publication of an Open Letter to Tehran.

In that Open Letter, there was an explicit warning to the Iranian theocracy that any agreement between Iran and The United States could be invalidated and nullified by the incoming Administration that takes over the reins of Government from President Barack Hussein Obama.

This Open Letter was signed by 47 Senators of The Republican Party, representing 87 percent of the total number of the **GOP – Grand Old Party** – Senators.

On March 11, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry told The Congress that a nuclear agreement with Iran would not be legally binding.

This suggests, rather definitively, that future Presidents of The United States might decide not to implement any such agreement, or any part thereof, reached today.

Iran's Foreign Minister Javad Zarif held discussions with Secretary of State John Kerry, on Monday, March 16, 2015, and, at the conclusion of these discussions, the Iranian Foreign Minister was quoted as saying, among other things, with regard to the contents of the Open Letter:

*'It is necessary that the stance of the US Administration be defined about this move.'*

That marathon meeting lasted for a good five hours and was held in Lausanne, Switzerland.

It is obvious that any agreement with Iran on limiting its nuclear capabilities has to be an Accord that is enduring for so long as to seem fixed or established, not one that is meant to be just for the Presidential term – or part of the term – of one US President.

In Washington D.C., President Barack Hussein Obama went on record as stating that he was *'committed to working very closely with the winner (of the Israeli elections) to cement and further deepen the strong relationship between The United States and Israel ...'*

But Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, on his last visit to Washington, managed to irk President Barack Hussein Obama, very visibly, with his remarks to The Congress in respect of Iran and its nuclear programme.

The Prime Minister of Israel has gone on record, in the past, stating that his country would not tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran.

One is reminded that Israel determined not to tolerate a nuclear-armed, Syrian Arab Republic and, when it was confirmed by Israel's Mossad – the country's intelligence branch of Government, as well as executing covert operations and engaging in counter-terrorism – that Syria's President Bashar al-Assad had endorsed a proposal to build nuclear reactors in the Syrian desert, Israeli warplanes destroyed the complex – in total.

While Secretary of State John Kerry smiles as he discusses the progress – or lack of progress – in the present round of talks with Iran, one is reminded, also, of former statements of the ultimate leader of Iran: Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei.

On January 14, 2014, Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei, who has held onto the reins of power in the country since June 4, 1989, made the claim that The United States has shown, time and again, positive active, and typically mutual hatred or ill will toward Iran:

*'We (Iran) had announced previously that on certain issues, if we feel it is expedient, we would negotiate with Satan (The United States) to deter evil ... The nuclear talks showed the enmity of America against Iran, Iranians, Islam and Muslims.'*

On February 3, 2012, Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei, addressing a crowd of worshipers in Tehran, following Friday prayers, said, among other things:

- (i) Iran would continue with its controversial nuclear programme;

- (ii) Any and all military strikes against Iran would only make the country stronger; and,
- (iii) *'From now on, in any place, if any nation or any group confronts the Zionist Regime (of Israel), we will endorse and we will help. We have no fear expressing this ... Israel is a cancerous tumour that should be cut and will be cut ...'*

One can well understand, on recalling the many jingoistic and bellicose comments of the ultimate ruler of Iran toward Israel, his tirade having been ongoing for some years, now, how Israel and its 8.24 million inhabitants, of which about 21 percent are of Arab descent, reacts.

In short: Can Israel trust Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei or any and all of his henchmen as they appear to be planning to eradicate the Jewish State from the map of the world, either covertly or overtly, directly, or with connivance of terrorist groups.

If Iran is permitted to have the capacity to continue with its nuclear programme, allowing it to manufacture weapons of mass destruction, including the amassing of a nuclear arsenal, will these weapons be aimed at Israel?

This is, without question, the fear of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and many, if not most, of those people who voted him back into power.

Is Iran the type of international partner that The United States covets?

Iran continues to maintain that, in its dealings with The United States, it is dealing with Satan, the angel who, in Jewish belief, is commanded by God to tempt humans to sin, to accuse the sinners, and to carry out God's punishment.

Irony is it not?

-- E N D --

*While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,  
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.*

*If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in  
TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to [editor@targetnewspapers.com](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com). TARGET  
does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the  
laws of libel.*