

CAN YOU TRUST IRAN TO KEEP ITS PROMISES ?

Can The United Nations be assured that The Islamic Republic of Iran will remain steadfast in respect of its promises with regard to international agreements?

In this medium's opinion, the short answer is: No.

And the Government of The United States of America, obviously, concurs with **TARGET**'s view, that being the underlying ratiocinate for the seemingly never-ending nuclear negotiations between the theocratic regime and the P5+1 – The United States of America, The Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, The Republic of France, The United Kingdom and The Republic of Germany.

The nuclear talks have been ongoing since December 2006 up to this very day – and, still, one is told that an agreement is not even close at hand.

Last Thursday, in Vienna, Austria, Mr John Kerry, Secretary of State of the US, went on record, stating, inter alia:

'This (meaning the nuclear talks with Iran) is not open-ended. We can't wait forever for the decision to be made. If the tough decision don't get made, we are absolutely prepared to call an end to this process.'

It was not the first time that delegates to the nuclear talks, which is aimed at ironing out diametrically opposed views on Iran's nuclear programme that Iran claims is for peaceful purposes, only, but which many people, around the world, believe is to produce weapons of mass destruction.

The Iranian delegates at these talks have found, over and over again, reasons for not agreeing with certain points in numerous suggested draft agreements that were supposed to be the basis for the P5+1 plus Iran to sign an Accord.

Last Thursday, while Secretary John Kerry sat pensively in the drawing room of the 19th Century Viennese Palace, which is hosting the negotiations, there were numerous angry exchanges between some of the foreign ministers in attendance as frustration boiled over, the Iranian delegates, intransigent in respect of their demands, without bothering to consider any compromise to their demands, a compromise that might have resulted in an agreement, being reached in principle – at least.

At one point, Secretary of State John Kerry and Mr Javad Zarif, the Foreign Minister of Iran, were said to have been on the verge of trading blows when a US aide was forced to intervene in order to calm the ever-muddling, negotiating waters.

Mr Federica Mogherini, Foreign Policy Chief for the **European Union (EU)**, threatened to leave the negotiating table and this threat was met with Mr Javad Zarif, shouting out words to the effect: *'Never threaten an Iranian!'*

The Foreign Minister of Russia, Mr Sergei Lavrov, added his two cents with *'nor a Russian!'*

This was smartly followed with the statements from Secretary John Kerry who, in effect, stated that enough was enough.

We Want Our Share Of Nuclear Power

As one, high-ranking Iranian cleric, who has not been involved, directly, in the nuclear talks, put it: If the US can drop atom bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, those two bombs, killing tens of thousands of Japanese citizens, why should not Iran be permitted to harness the power of the atom in order to engage in the production of energy via nuclear fission: A nuclear reaction whereby a heavy nucleus splits spontaneously or on impact with another particle, and by so doing, there is an immediate release of energy.

It is widely accepted that the heads of state of the US, France, Russia and Israel, just to mention only this quartet of countries that is known to possess nuclear weaponry, can be relied upon not to use these weapons of mass destruction without the express permission of the citizens of the countries to whom they have a legal and fiduciary duty by virtue of the high executive offices that they hold.

In countries of the world, today, where there exists checks and balances in governments, there is a separation of powers between three distinct and interdependent branches of government, namely, the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive.

In Iran, which is a theocracy (or theocratic republic, if you will), there is the executive branch of government and the clergy, with the clergy, being the ultimate arbiter of all things with the exception of those duties that the clergy delegates to the executive branch of government.

In a theocracy, a deity is accepted as the supreme ruler and, as such, civil laws are interpreted in accordance with opinions, obtained from ecclesiastical authority.

It follows that a government of such a state, either democratically elected or promoted and then installed by direct intervention of the powers-that-be, is subject, directly, to religious authority.

This is the position in Iran, today, where Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei is widely recognised (and revered by many) as the Ultimate Ruler of the country.

It matters not a hoot that which high-ranking members of the Executive Branch of the Government of Iran might agree with the P5+1 with regard to the nuclear talks, because, in the final analysis, Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei will have the last say.

And his word is law.

It is well known that Iran's Ultimate Ruler does not trust the Government of The United States of America and has referred to the Administration of President Barack Hussein Obama as being '*the shaitan*' in Washington, D.C..

He has condescended to negotiate with the shaitan only '*if we (Iran) feel it is expedient*' so to do.

Such condescension on the part of Ayatollah Ali Hoseini-Khamenei is suggestive that he holds himself out to be the superior of President Barack Hussein Obama but, due to circumstances, he must, in the interests of his high, theocratic office, negotiate with the devil in order to achieve certain goals as prescribed by religious (Islamic) teachings and in reference to the Holy Q'ran.

Last Tuesday-week (July 2), it was reported that President Barack Hussein Obama expressed his belief, obviously based on his discussions with Secretary John Kerry, that a final agreement with Iran in respect of the nuclear talks had, at most, a 50-50 chance of success.

Today, that 50-50 chance has been reduced to zero.

The President of Iran, Mr Hassan Rouhani, has stated, definitively, that, if the nuclear talks were to break down, irretrievably, Iran would resume suspended atomic work.

Last Thursday, also, Hongkong time, President Hassan Rouhani was in Ufa, Russia, holding talks with Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi.

He, also, held bilateral talks with President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin of Russia and President Xi Jin Ping of the People's Republic of China.

It is, always, nice to have friends in high places, especially those friends who just might be sitting by one's side at the negotiating table.

For More With Regard To The Nuclear Talks Between The P5+1 and Iran,
Please Refer To:

TARGET Intelligence Report, Volume XVII, Number 130.

Published On Thursday, June 18, 2015,

Headlined:

**'THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN AND ITS NUCLEAR PROGRAMME:
BOOM!'**

-- 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. TARGET
does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the
laws of libel.*

