

# *The Last Check*

*Why de-escalation is the only deal that still exists.*

*By Reinout Schotman*

*Essay 9 in the Gulf Series*



## **The Empty Table**

The zone of possible agreement no longer exists. What Iran will accept, the United States cannot offer. What the United States demands, Iran will not concede. There is no deal.

The pattern that produced this impasse has been visible at every scale. In business: acquiring power without converting it into durable value. Asset stripping. Shock without design. In geopolitics: four self-declared principles of negotiation, four violations, a method with no second act. This essay follows the line in the series to the only domain that remains.

The pattern operates at three scales. At the level of real estate: bankruptcies. At the level of alliances: eroding trust. At the level of nuclear weapons: existential risk. The mechanism is identical at each scale. Scale does not determine the logic. Scale determines the consequence.

The pattern is not new. The scale is new. And when a method, described in *The Art of the Deal*, built for extraction meets a conflict where capitulation will not come, and every conventional option has been exhausted, the calculation shifts toward the only domain that still promises an immediate result.

## The Escalation Ladder

Four analytical frameworks converge on the same conclusion. Each arrives from a different tradition. The convergence is the argument.

Herman Kahn's *On Escalation* (1965) remains the standard work on how conflicts move from conventional to nuclear. His ladder contains forty-four rungs. The relevant zone: rung fifteen, "barely nuclear war," to rung twenty-one, "local nuclear war." Kahn's central insight is structural: each rung makes the next feel subjectively more rational to the decision-maker, while the objective risk increases exponentially. The perception of control at every level is an illusion produced by the structure itself.

Every conventional exit has been closed. Conventional military means have been exhausted without producing the desired outcome. The deal has been destroyed. Withdrawal is politically unacceptable. Continuation produces no different result. The only step that promises a different outcome is the step into the nuclear domain. Not because the decision-maker wants nuclear war. Because the structure has eliminated every other option.

Thomas Schelling provides the second mechanism. In *The Strategy of Conflict* (1960) and *Arms and Influence* (1966), Schelling described "the threat that leaves something to chance": the power of a nuclear threat lies not in the willingness to execute it, but in the fact that the situation can spiral beyond anyone's explicit decision. The risk of inadvertent war arises not from choice but from structure. The current conflict has already demonstrated this mechanism at conventional level: an administration that dismantled its own feedback systems created a situation in which control leaked away. Schelling describes the mechanism by which that loss of control accelerates at nuclear level.

Kahn and Schelling wrote for the Cold War: two superpowers, both secular, both bureaucratic, both operating within a shared framework of rationality. This conflict meets none of those conditions. On one side, a decision-maker who has replaced institutional analysis with personal intuition, who has dismantled the feedback systems that would tell him where on the ladder he stands. On the other, a system that operates rationally but within a theological and ideological framework that defines sacrifice not as cost but as investment, and that measures strategic time in decades and centuries rather than electoral cycles. The models understate the danger. The structure they describe becomes more dangerous, not less, when the condition of shared rationality does not hold.

Robert Pape of the University of Chicago provides the empirical confirmation. His two decades of war simulations involving Iran demonstrate that precision strikes produce tactical success and strategic disappointment, and that the response of policymakers is not to revise the strategy but to escalate. Pape identifies five escalation steps in the current conflict. He describes three: air war, horizontal escalation by the weaker party, and ground troops on Iranian soil. He assigned a seventy-five percent probability that the United States escalates to step three. And this likelihood has only increased with time.

Steps four and five Pape does not name. That choice is itself analytically significant. This essay goes one step further: it identifies step four, tactical nuclear use, as the structural consequence of the impasse. It does not go to step five. The reason is set out in a later section.

The fourth framework is mathematical. The Cramér-Rao bound (1945) places a hard limit on what can ever be known from data. When the data contains no information about what you need to know, more data does not help. The decision-maker contemplating a “limited” nuclear weapon operates in the domain of pure ambiguity: unknown variables with unknown outcomes. The information content of any available data about the reaction of other nuclear states to a first American use since 1945 is zero. There are no data. The taboo has never been broken. There is no historical frequency. The decision-maker believes he can calculate the consequences. The mathematics says he cannot.

The nuclear taboo functions as norm, not law. Cumulative, reinforced by every crisis in which it held. Destroyed by the first violation. Not diminished. Destroyed. Saudi Arabia has publicly declared it will acquire nuclear weapons if Iran does. Pakistan has confirmed availability. The cascade moves from projection to trajectory.

The argument is not that a nuclear weapon will be used. The argument is that the threshold is lower than at any point since 1945, that the structure makes each step feel more rational, that control is already leaking, that the pattern is unfolding empirically, and that the consequences are unknowable. That combination is the danger.

*The danger does not reside in the intention of the decision-maker. It resides in the architecture of the position, the illusion of control, and the unknowability of what follows.*

## **The Calculation for Capitol Hill**

The US's War Powers Resolution of 1973 exists for precisely this situation. The mechanism is constitutional. The question is whether it is used.

Power without permission is brittle. This is not a slogan. It is a structural observation. When power is exercised without the consent of the institutions designed to grant that consent, it becomes fragile at the moment it is most needed. The current president operates on the assumption that power replaces permission. Congress is the only institution with the constitutional authority to change course. If it does not exercise that authority, the nuclear threshold is de facto delegated to an individual whose method has no second act and whose approach to power produces no durable value.

Two options remain.

Intervention to de-escalate. The electoral cost is high and certain. What it protects: the architecture of international order. The Non-Proliferation Treaty. The dollar. The alliances. The nuclear taboo. Future negotiating capacity.

Non-intervention. The electoral risk is avoided in the short term. What it produces: a president on an escalation ladder whose structure makes each step more rational, with consequences that are structurally unknowable. The risk is not that the outcome is chosen. The risk is that the system reaches a point at which it can no longer be prevented. Which means are off limits? A nuclear weapon destroys the order the winner needs. Who pays the costs? The Gulf states, Europe, future generations. None of them consented.

A certain electoral loss of limited magnitude is preferable to an uncertain loss of unbounded magnitude (Taleb, 2007). That is not ethics. That is mathematics. When the potential downside is unlimited, the expected cost of inaction always exceeds the certain cost of action, regardless of the probability.

*Permission that is not exercised is transferred. The question is not whether Congress may intervene. The question is to whom it delegates the nuclear threshold if it does not.*

### **Loss as Strategic Discipline**

Effectiveness is not efficiency (Drucker, 1967). The American war machine is extraordinarily efficient at destroying. It is entirely ineffective at producing the desired outcome. Efficiency without effectiveness is activity without direction.

The war continues because the psychological cost of stopping exceeds the material cost of continuing. That is the definition of an exit barrier (Porter, 1980). But whoever holds a losing position too long destroys the capacity for future contests (Henderson, 1968). The resources, alliances, and credibility consumed in this war are not renewable. Every week spent on a position that cannot produce victory is a week subtracted from the capacity to shape whatever comes next.

De-escalation is not the acceptance of loss. It is the protection of the conditions under which winning remains possible.

Strategy defines direction. Morality grants permission. The direction leads toward a precipice. The permission to change course exists. The question is whether anyone uses it.

### **Why This Essay Stops Where It Stops**

Earlier in this series, I presented four scenarios for the end of this war. The most likely was a China-facilitated de-escalation. The nuclear cascade scenario appeared, but at the margin. This essay places it at the centre.

That is not a retraction. It is the consequence of what has changed since. The conventional impasse has deepened, not narrowed. The language by all actors hardens. US troops are arriving in the region. The dealmaker has no moves left. This essay examines what happens when the window for de-escalation closes before it is used. Not because de-escalation has become impossible. But because the decision-maker who must initiate it is structurally incapable of accepting loss.

There is also a more honest explanation. When I wrote that earlier analysis, I pushed the nuclear escalation to the margin. Not only because the analysis justified it, but also because the conclusion was too uncomfortable. I live in the region I analyse. My wife works there. I have sat in shelters in Abu Dhabi every day since the start of the war. The analysis I present here is the same analysis I did not fully complete before. This essay is an extension, a correction, if you will.

The upper boundary of the model is tactical nuclear escalation. It falls within the model because it remains intentional, instrumentalised, and perceived as controllable. Mutual assured destruction, MAD, falls outside it. That boundary is analytical. It follows from the axioms of the model itself: an outcome that eliminates all decision-makers cannot belong to a model that presupposes decisions. MAD eliminates the actors, the incentives, and the system within which strategy operates. The model is complete. But it is bounded.

But the boundary is also personal. And that deserves honesty.

Robert Pape, who has run war simulations with Iran for twenty years, describes three of his five escalation steps. At steps four and five he stops. This essay goes one step further: it names step four. It does not go to step five. The reason is the same as Pape's, and one reason more.

There are two reasons why mutual assured destruction is not the endpoint of this analysis. The first is rational: no actor chooses mutual annihilation, which by definition places it outside the domain of strategic choice. The second is personal: I refuse to accept a model in which humanity ceases to exist. Not as an analytical objection, but as a human one. The scientist in me can make the calculation. The person in me refuses to acknowledge it as an outcome. Both responses are true. Both may stand side by side.

This is the point at which the analyst sets down his instrument. Not because the instrument cannot go further. But because the person holding it decides that further produces nothing that can guide action.

*The boundary of this essay is not a limitation of courage. It is a limitation of domain. Beyond that boundary, an analyst can say nothing that helps anyone.*

## **Where To?**

The first essay in this series began with a man, me, on a balcony in Abu Dhabi. A drone passed at eye level. The question was personal and geographical: should we stay, or should we go?

The second essay showed that trust does not travel through official channels but through relationships. It travels through the person on the other end of a phone call who says: it is safe enough here to build a life.

Nine essays later the question has shifted. The decision now being taken, by a senator, a general, a president who cannot lose, does not determine where someone goes. It determines whether a destination still exists where that phone call can be made.

The expatriate on the balcony had a choice. The decision-maker in Washington does not hold that privilege any longer. His choice is not personal. It is structural.

And the question is no longer “should we stay or should we go?”

*The question is: where to?*

## References

- Cramér, H. (1946). *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*. Princeton University Press.
- Drucker, P. (1967). *The Effective Executive*. Harper & Row.
- Fisher, R. & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Henderson, B. (1968). *The Experience Curve*. Boston Consulting Group.
- Kahn, H. (1965). *On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios*. Praeger.
- Pape, R. (1996). *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War*. Cornell University Press.
- Pape, R. (2026). "The Escalation Trap." *Foreign Affairs / Substack*, March 2026.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors*. Free Press.
- Rao, C.R. (1945). "Information and the Accuracy Attainable in the Estimation of Statistical Parameters." *Bulletin of the Calcutta Mathematical Society*, 37, 81–91.
- Schelling, T. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard University Press.
- Schelling, T. (1966). *Arms and Influence*. Yale University Press.
- Taleb, N.N. (2007). *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*. Random House.
- Trump, D. & Schwartz, T. (1987). *The Art of the Deal*. Random House.
- War Powers Resolution, 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541–1548 (1973).

## Previous Essays In This Series

### 1. The Overlooked Risk Behind the Gulf Conflict

Why expat confidence may matter more than whether missiles landed. The first essay describes the experience of missile alerts in Abu Dhabi and argues that the quiet departure of expatriate professionals is the most consequential and most overlooked risk of the Gulf conflict.

[outdoorconnect.ae/the-overlooked-risk-behind-the-gulf-conflict](https://outdoorconnect.ae/the-overlooked-risk-behind-the-gulf-conflict)

### 2. The Network the UAE Already Has

Why rebuilding expat confidence requires activating a trust network, not launching a campaign. Proposes mobility credits as a precision instrument to convert the UAE's existing expatriate base into a distributed confidence infrastructure.

[outdoorconnect.ae/the-network-the-uae-already-has](https://outdoorconnect.ae/the-network-the-uae-already-has)

### 3. When Strategies Fail

How the United States entered a war it could not strategically win. Introduces the distinction between assets and control points and argues that Iran reframed the conflict as an endurance contest the US was not equipped to win.

[outdoorconnect.ae/when-strategies-fail](https://outdoorconnect.ae/when-strategies-fail)

### 4. The Silent.

A work of strategic fiction. A wounded leader in a hidden room, four visitors, and a decision that was always coming. Explores the logic of Iran's nuclear decision through narrative, and asks what happens when a system is designed to outlast the attack that destroys its leader.

[outdoorconnect.ae/the-silent](https://outdoorconnect.ae/the-silent)

### 5. When Knowledge Systems Collide

Why the war the United States is losing was lost before it began. Argues that a mathematical law places a hard limit on what intelligence systems can know, and that the variables that determined the outcome of this war — intention, patience, belief, willingness to sacrifice — fall outside that limit.

[outdoorconnect.ae/when-knowledge-systems-collide](https://outdoorconnect.ae/when-knowledge-systems-collide)

## 6. The Last Meeting

What if the target designed the strike? Examines the evidence that Ali Khamenei knew the attack was coming and chose to stay, using the predictability of the American and Israeli decision model as a weapon. Proposes that Iran's leadership may have engineered the conditions that produced exactly the outcome it needed.

[outdoorconnect.ae/the-last-meeting](https://outdoorconnect.ae/the-last-meeting)

## 7. What the War Produces

How the Gulf conflict ends, and what it leaves behind. Analyses the four plausible end-states of the war and argues that in all scenarios the structural direction is the same: American influence diminishes, China's position strengthens, and the non-proliferation architecture degrades. Examines why Iran may have already achieved everything it needed from a war it did not start.

[outdoorconnect.ae/what-the-war-produces](https://outdoorconnect.ae/what-the-war-produces)

## 8. The Art of the Deal

How the self-proclaimed dealmaker destroyed his own deal. Tests Trump's negotiation against the four principles of his own book and finds four violations. Argues that the zone of possible agreement no longer exists, that Iran holds the control points that determine endurance, and that a method designed to produce capitulation has no second act when the counterparty does not fold.

[outdoorconnect.ae/the-art-of-the-deal](https://outdoorconnect.ae/the-art-of-the-deal)

### From the author

Outdoor Connect is an independent strategy advisory platform focused on board-level value creation for mid-sized, growth-driven companies (€50–€1B). We bring direct senior engagement—without the traditional consulting pyramid—to help founders, CEOs and boards set direction, make sharper capital allocation choices, and embed an execution rhythm. Core areas include growth strategy in technology and the energy transition, strategic repositioning in fragmented markets, and board-level sparring on value creation and M&A preparation.

© Outdoor Connect 2026. All rights reserved. 3/26