

CHAPTER 11

MANAGING THE IRANIAN THREAT TO SEA COMMERCE DIPLOMATICALLY

Douglas E. Streusand

Between the completion of this chapter and its appearance in print, new developments doubtless will have occurred in the continuing saga of Iran's nuclear program and the global response to it. In all probability, these changes will take the form of evolution, not resolution. The Iranian nuclear program will remain a matter of international contention for years, as North Korea's has, rather than ending with a bang like Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs, or in a whimper like, apparently, Libya's. Despite all the rhetoric about the possible use of force against Iran, whether to overthrow the regime or to destroy nuclear facilities, there are substantial reasons for the Bush administration to avoid the use of force and choose to manage the threat of a nuclear Iran. If it becomes a lasting problem, it requires management.

In Richard Haass's words,

Management is not a solution, which implies the end of conflict through a meeting of the minds, engendered by compromise, but something very different . . . [When a solution is not possible] the best that can reasonably be expected . . . is . . . to bring about some modest degree of progress, or, failing that, at least keep things from getting worse.¹

This chapter presents and evaluates a series of diplomatic options for coping with a nuclear Iran with particular reference to the Strait of Hormuz and the Persian Gulf. The vital role of the Strait in the world energy market, admirably explained by Dagobert Brito and Amy Jaffe in their chapter,² and Iran's status as a major producer of petroleum and natural gas, make the management of any Iranian crisis a matter of vital global interest. Iran's international economic importance, pivotal geopolitical position, and large population make it a far different proposition than North Korea. This chapter argues

that the importance of the Strait of Hormuz as the world's jugular vein implies opportunity as well as vulnerability. The chapter has four sections: (1) an exposition of the problem to be managed, (2) a discussion of three historical management regimes which offer precedents for the current problem: the Lausanne Convention, which governed the use of the Turkish Strait from 1923 to 1936, the Montreux Convention, which replaced the Lausanne Convention and remains in force, and the Prevention of Incidents at Sea Agreement between the United States and Soviet navies; (3) an examination of possible methods of managing tensions; and, (4) a conclusion. The chapter presents only modest proposals, in the literal sense of the term. Despite their modesty, they may well fail to win international approval. But even suggesting them might give the United States additional leverage.

STATING THE PROBLEM

The nature of the Iranian regime, not the power of nuclear weapons, makes a nuclear Iran a threat to the United States. Though we profess to frown upon nuclear proliferation in principle, in practice the context matters more than the fact. Iran's Islamic totalitarian ideology and record of supporting international terrorism distinguish it from all other nuclear powers; North Korea is the only other state with a similar record which has or shortly may have nuclear capability. The United States has not taken preemptive action against North Korea, primarily because of North Korea's conventional deterrent. North Korea's conventional capabilities, especially tube and rocket artillery capable of hitting Seoul, give North Korea the ability to massively retaliate to an attack without WMD.³ Iran's ability to block passage through the Strait of Hormuz, albeit temporarily, constitutes a comparable conventional deterrent. If, however, Iran does obtain a nuclear deterrent, it would have greater freedom to use its other capabilities.

Iran might use nuclear weapons against Israel, against U.S. or allied interests abroad, or even against the United States or supply them to a terrorist proxy. It has tested medium range ballistic missiles; Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) analysis in 1999 suggested that Iran could test an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of

reaching the continental United States within 10 years.⁴ This threat adds to the justifications for global ballistic missile defense, but Iran, despite its Islamic totalitarian ideology, is not necessarily more likely to use nuclear weapons than any other state. The regime, despite its confidence about the next world, wishes to survive in this one and thus to avoid suffering nuclear retaliation. Even supplying nuclear weapons to terrorists would be extremely risky; Iran hardly could expect to avoid being held responsible. Iran is far more likely to use nuclear weapons the way nuclear powers have used them since 1945, as a deterrent, however aggressive its intentions are. The oft repeated, if not confirmed, statement of a senior Iranian officer to an Indian counterpart that Operation DESERT STORM taught one great lesson: never confront the United States without nuclear weapons, is consistent with this position.⁵ It suggests that with a nuclear deterrent the Islamic Republic might perceive itself free to take provocative actions with conventional or irregular forces. The possible range of such actions extends far beyond the Gulf and Strait, but Iran would have the most leverage in that critical region. Diplomatic management of a nuclear Iran must thus include preventing Iran from taking provocative military action in the Gulf under the cover of its nuclear deterrent.

Iran's military programs reflect its identity and foreign policy. Beyond survival, it has two competing yet complementary agendas, the national and the revolutionary. Inevitably, if ironically, the Islamic Republic shares much of the vision of the late Shah: Iran as the dominant power in the Persian Gulf by virtue of location, population, wealth, and history.⁶ Like the Pahlavi regime, the Islamic Republic fears a superpower; unlike the Pahlavi regime, it cannot rely on another superpower for protection. The Islamic Republic also faces three regional nuclear powers, India, Pakistan, and Israel. The national aspect of Iran's agenda includes a compelling argument for nuclear weapons.⁷ The acquisition of nuclear weapons also offers Iran a cheaper way of improving its military position than modernizing its conventional forces.⁸ Thus far, there is no indication that international efforts to dissuade Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons will work, and little reason to believe that even a more representative Iranian government would relinquish nuclear

ambitions.⁹ If Iran's conventional deterrent, and other considerations make preemption too dangerous or costly, management is the only alternative. It must begin with deterrence and containment.¹⁰ A diplomatic approach would be a complement to military capability and entirely dependent upon it.

U.S. interest in the Strait of Hormuz has not changed since 1971, when Great Britain relinquished responsibility for keeping order in the Persian Gulf, or perhaps since the first oil shock of 1973: to prevent interference with free and safe passage through the Strait from disrupting the global petroleum market. This concern goes far beyond preventing an actual halt to passage through the Strait; concrete threats and even vague fears raise tension and prices. This interest, of course, goes beyond the Strait themselves; any disruption in the production and distribution of Persian Gulf petroleum harms the global economy and might harm global order. The Strait draws special attention because more petroleum is more vulnerable there than anywhere else. Although the Iranian military lacks the ability to sustain a blockade of the Strait against a sustained U.S. effort to open them, it certainly has the ability to close them temporarily. A leading expert on Iran's military forces has concluded that Iran has the ability to interfere significantly with Gulf traffic and perhaps to block the Strait of Hormuz temporarily with anti-ship missiles and mines.¹¹ Any form of naval engagement in the Strait might leave wrecks which would interfere with navigation until they were cleared, not to mention the potential for environmental damage if loaded tankers were sunk or petroleum facilities damaged. Insofar as the issue may be limited to the Strait themselves, the preservation of free and secure navigation matters the most.

The dependence on petroleum traffic, of course, runs both ways; the exporters depend on it as much as the importers do. A closure of the Strait would harm all concerned. Does that mutual dependence create a mutual deterrence on which all concerned may rely, making the vulnerability of the Strait a nonissue? Unfortunately, it does not. Faced with what it considered an existential threat to the regime, the leadership of the Islamic Republic of Iran certainly would be willing to close the Strait, however destructive the effects would be on their own economy.¹² Two generations ago, the Mossadeq government deprived itself of oil revenue when it nationalized the oil industry.¹³

Iran's economy is far more dependent on oil and gas export revenues today than in 1952, but the regime could survive a short blockage. Since a far larger proportion of world energy supplies comes from the Persian Gulf now than in the past, Iran has greater leverage now than it did under Mossadeq.

The U.S. interest in the security of Gulf petroleum goes far beyond the Strait. Since 1973, the United States has employed a variety of strategies to secure our interests in the Gulf, from the "twin pillars" policy – reliance on Iran and Saudi Arabia as U.S. proxies to keep order – of the 1970s to the dual containment policy of the 1990s. Until 2003 at least, two themes have remained consistent through all the changes in policy and administrations: protection of the production and distribution of petroleum from external attack, whether from the Soviet Union, the Islamic Republic of Iran, or Saddam's Iraq; and support of stable regimes against internal subversion, whether from the Communist left or the Islamist right. Operation IRAQI FREEDOM and the George W. Bush administration's new emphasis on the promotion of democracy in the Middle East have altered these themes, though encouragement for the Gulf regimes to develop more representative institutions (especially the smaller members of the Gulf Cooperation Council [GCC]) is hardly new and produced palpable results in the 1990s.¹⁴ The destruction of the Ba`ath regime in Iraq eliminated any possible counter to Iran from within the region for years to come. The GCC countries still lack the ability to counterbalance Iranian power. It will take years for Iraq to regain the ability even to defend itself. There is no power capable of preventing Iran from dominating the Gulf except for the United States.¹⁵

These realities fix the parameters of the international issue requiring management: the conflict between Iran's national objective of regional dominance and revolutionary objective of spreading Islamic totalitarianism and the Western objective of security for the production and transportation of oil and natural gas from the Gulf region. Any reduction in tension and uncertainty in the Gulf and Strait would affect global oil and natural gas prices directly by reducing insurance premiums on shipments without reducing the income of the producers. It thus would serve the interests of both producers and consumers. For this reason at least, the competition between the United States and Iran is not a zero sum game, creating opportunities

for mutually beneficial management. The lack of diplomatic relations and persistent hostility between the United States and Iran does not make the establishment of a management regime impossible, though it certainly makes it more difficult. The United States has negotiated with and entered into agreements with North Korea, though the results hardly have been encouraging. But a management regime would not necessarily involve direct negotiations; it might consist merely of an exchange of public statements. It also might involve the creation of a multilateral organization specifically to deal with the Strait of Hormuz or the Gulf as a whole; it might or might not have a regional disarmament component.

Any such diplomatic initiative would have to be fail-safe, meaning it would need to meet three criteria. First, the presentation of the initiative would need to strengthen the standing and credibility of the United States, globally and regionally, even if Iran rejected it. Second, if Iran accepted the initiative and then violated it after it went into effect, the stigma or penalty Iran would need to suffer by doing so would need to outweigh substantially any disadvantage to the United States. Concretely, the United States must retain the ability to blockade Iranian shipping outside the Persian Gulf, as well as to take effective military action against Iranian territory. Third, if Iran accepted the arrangement and abided by it, the result would need to make disruption of traffic through the Strait of Hormuz, and, preferably, of the supply of hydrocarbons from the Gulf in general, less likely. Any diplomatic initiative which did meet these criteria would warrant serious investigation. It, of course, would not deal with Iran's nuclear program directly and would, in fact, constitute an entirely separate diplomatic track.

THE PRECEDENTS

A different set of Straits preoccupied global statesmen for most of the 19th and 20th centuries. The "Straits Question," the question of control over access to the Black Sea through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, was the core of the Eastern Question, the unknown prognosis of the Ottoman Empire, the "Sick Man of Europe". It attracted enough attention to add the word "jingoism" to the English

language; the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78 inspired a popular song in Britain with the refrain:

We don't want to fight, but, by jingo if we do
We've got the ships, we've got the men, we've got the money too.
We've fought the Bear before, and while Britons shall be true,
The Russians shall not have Constantinople!¹⁶

The European powers addressed the Straits Question in a series of treaties, beginning with the London Protocol of 1830 and ending with the Montreux Convention. Evaluation of the terms and functioning of the Montreux Convention and the preceding Lausanne Convention thus requires review of the history behind them.

Geopolitics, not geography or the routine functioning of international law, made the Straits Question a question. The Dardanelles is no more than four miles wide, and the Bosphorus even narrower. As long as a single state controlled both shores, the Straits ordinarily would be the territorial waters of that state, and the Sea of Marmara between them an enclosed sea. When the Ottoman Empire was a great power, there could be no Straits Question. The Treaty of Kucuk Kaynarca of 1774 ended that era. It established the Russian presence on the Black Sea littoral and awarded Russian ships free navigation through the Straits. The other major European powers gained similar rights by individual treaties; the Black Sea, for centuries an Ottoman lake, became an international waterway. Access to the sea for commerce, however, did not make the Straits a matter of high politics. The Russian desire to dominate the Black Sea and to gain unfettered access to the Mediterranean Sea through the acquisition of Constantinople did so. Britain, the chief maritime power of the time, regarded Russian control of the Straits an unacceptable threat to her interests. It would have created a fundamental asymmetry, with the Russian fleet able to penetrate the Mediterranean and the Black Sea closed to outside forces. The British determination to deny the Straits to Russia kept the Sick Man of Europe alive. The Anglo-Russian rivalry over the Straits formed the complement of the "Great Game," the competition between the two powers in Central Asia.¹⁷

In its broader form, then, the Straits question concerned control of Constantinople and the Straits littoral; the more narrow form,

which the diplomatic instruments generally addressed, concerned the passage of shipping, especially naval forces, through the Straits. The Anglo-Turkish Treaty of 1809 stated that the prohibition of the passage of foreign warships through the Straits was an “ancient rule” of the Ottoman Empire. Britain sought to transform the ban from an Ottoman policy to international law. Russia sought to replace the ban with an exclusive privilege to use the Straits for naval purposes. The procession of treaties governing the use of the Straits during the 19th century reflected the ebb and flow of British and Russian fortunes and interests. The 1841 London Convention prohibited all foreign naval shipping, with some minor exceptions, from passing through the Straits; subsequent treaties in the 19th century continued this arrangement. This compromise satisfied Russia because it kept the superior Royal Navy out of the Black Sea, and Britain because it kept the Russian fleet from threatening the Mediterranean lifeline to India. In essence, this situation remained stable so long as no outside force altered the policies of Britain and Russia. In the 20th century, Germany twice became that outside force.¹⁸

When the Ottoman Empire entered World War I by permitting the German battlecruiser *Goeben* and cruiser *Breslau* to enter the Dardanelles and closing the Straits to pursuing British warships, it ended, temporarily, the conflict between Britain and Russia over the Straits. Turkish control of the Straits blocked the best route for British supplies to reach Russia; the British leadership considered the Russian alliance essential for the defeat of Germany. Although the Allied efforts to force the Straits failed, British opposition to Russian control of the Straits ended. Russia demanded possession of Constantinople and the entire western shore of the Straits and the Sea of Marmara; Britain agreed. That commitment later became part of what is generally known as the Sykes-Picot Agreement, although Russian foreign minister Sergei Sazanov also signed it, and it was negotiated in Petrograd in 1916.¹⁹

When the war ended, the Russian Empire had ceased to exist, and the Soviet regime had renounced the Russian claims on Ottoman territory. The Armistice of Mudros, which ended hostilities with the Ottoman empire on October 31, 1918, opened the Straits to Allied shipping and permitted the Allies to occupy Constantinople and the Bosphorus fortifications. The Allies addressed the future of the

Ottoman Empire in the Treaty of Sevres, signed August 10, 1920. The Treaty called for the partition of the Ottoman Empire. It assigned the western shore of the Straits except Constantinople to Greece; an Ottoman rump would retain control of Constantinople and the eastern shore. Those states, however, would delegate sovereignty over both shores of the Straits, designated as the Straits Zone, to a Straits Commission, consisting of representatives of the Allied powers. Under the Commission, all ships and aircraft would have virtually unfettered freedom of navigation in the Straits, in peace and war.²⁰

TREATIES GOVERNING USE OF TURKISH STRAIT

The Lausanne Convention.

The emergence of the new Turkey under Mustafa Kemal, later Kemal Ataturk, rendered the Treaty of Sevres moot. When Kemal's forces, already in control of Anatolia, approached the Allied garrison at Constantinople in October 1922, Britain and Greece agreed to an armistice and revision of the Treaty of Sevres. During the course of the negotiations which produced the Treaty of Lausanne, signed July 24, 1923, Ataturk put a formal end to the Ottoman Empire and established Turkey as a republic. The Soviet Union, now firmly established, participated in the Lausanne negotiations. The Lausanne Treaty gave the new republic full sovereignty over Anatolia and a small enclave in Europe, including the important city of Edirne, but not control over the Straits. The old polarity between Britain and Russia over the Straits had reappeared. The Soviet delegation at Lausanne supported Turkish sovereignty over the Straits with commercial traffic entirely unrestricted and naval passage entirely prohibited, a return to the status quo ante bellum. Britain and the other Western powers, however, wanted to retain the Sevres arrangements for the Straits. Prolonged and difficult negotiations produced the Convention of Lausanne, signed August 14, 1923, which was separate from the broader Treaty of Lausanne and dealt only with the Straits Question.²¹

The Lausanne Convention had four main provisions: freedom of navigation through the Straits, demilitarization of the Straits,

an international guarantee for the security of the Straits, and the establishment of a Straits Commission to execute the provisions of the Convention. This arrangement satisfied neither Turkey, which did not gain sovereignty over the Straits, nor the Soviet Union, which confronted the possibility of facing hostile naval forces in the Black Sea. But the Convention protected Soviet interests to a degree. It distinguished between riparian states, states on the shores of the Black Sea, and nonriparian outside powers. No outside power could send into the Black Sea a naval force larger than the most powerful riparian fleet, inevitably but not explicitly that of the Soviet Union, but outside powers had the unconditional right to send flotillas of up to three ships, with the largest not to exceed ten thousand tons. This provision tacitly prohibited outside capital ships—battleships and aircraft carriers—from entering the Black Sea. In time of war, these arrangements did not change if Turkey was neutral; if Turkey was a belligerent, neutral warships retained the right to pass through the Straits but enemy ships and aircraft were prohibited. The Straits Commission, not Turkey, had the right and the responsibility to enforce these provisions. This arrangement reassured the Soviets about a possible threat from the Black Sea, but permitted the nonriparian states to operate naval forces there and assured international control of the Straits. Although Turkey was deprived of control over the Straits and sovereignty over the Straits littoral, Atatürk had every reason for satisfaction with the broader settlement of the Treaty of Lausanne and priorities beyond the Straits.²²

The growth of German power in the 1930s reduced the importance of British and Soviet differences over the Straits and increased the value of Turkey as a potential ally. This situation gave Turkey the opportunity to obtain a revision of the Lausanne Convention. The revision of other components of the postwar settlement provided the Turks with a pretext for requesting revision of the Convention in 1933, though the conference to do so did not meet until 1936.²³

The Montreux Convention.

During the complex series of negotiations which produced the Montreux Convention, Britain took the position that the Straits were

an “international waterway connecting two international seas.”²⁴ The Soviets sought to differentiate between the Mediterranean as an international sea and the Black Sea as a closed one. To the Turks, the issue of Black Sea access mattered less than that of sovereignty over the Straits and the Straits littoral. Turkey’s ability to occupy the Straits Zone unilaterally, as Germany had the Rhineland, gave the Turks considerable leverage, as the terms of the Convention indicate. It gave each of the major participants in the negotiations enough of their objectives to make the arrangement acceptable. For Britain, the principle of freedom of navigation in the Straits became a matter of international law, and nonriparian states gained the right to operate substantial but limited naval forces in the Black Sea. For the Soviet Union, the restrictions on nonriparian naval forces in the Black Sea and the privilege of passing large naval units through the Straits mitigated failure to gain closed status for the Black Sea. Turkey got full sovereignty, including the right to fortify the Straits, but not sovereign control of navigation.

The provisions of the Convention restrict commercial navigation in the Straits only if Turkey is at war, or regards war as imminent. In that circumstance, nonbelligerent vessels may pass the Straits as long as their passage does not assist Turkey’s enemies, which implies Turkey’s right to inspect passing vessels. The Convention does not distinguish between the riparian and nonriparian states with regard to commercial navigation. In peacetime, small warships and naval auxiliaries of both riparian and nonriparian states may pass the Straits without restriction in daylight. Submarines of Black Sea navies may pass through the Straits on the surface, but only if constructed outside the Black Sea for use within it or for repair at outside yards and return from them, not for routine deployment. Nonriparian states may send no more than 15,000 tons of naval shipping through the Straits at one time; riparian states may exceed that tonnage—and thus send capital ships through the Straits—if their large units have no more than two accompanying destroyers. Nonriparian states may not maintain a total of more than 30,000 tons in the Black Sea at any given time, but this provision is subject to change. If the strongest riparian fleet—meaning the Soviet fleet—expanded by 10,000 tons from its size at the time of the signature

of the Convention, the permissible size of nonriparian fleets was to grow to 45,000 tons. Nonriparian naval forces may not remain in the Black Sea longer than 21 days. If Turkey is at war or, significantly, regards itself in imminent danger of war, the passage of combatant ships, of any power, becomes subject to its sole discretion. The wording of the Convention makes it effectively perpetual unless one of the signatories gives notice of intent to denounce.²⁵

The Montreux Convention remains in force to this day. It has survived through 7 decades of geopolitical turbulence not because the conflict of interests over the Straits ended, but because it managed the situation well enough that none of the parties had sufficient motivation to raise tensions enough to change it. It has been a classic example of successful management as Haass describes it. The Soviet Union sought to alter the terms of the Convention, before, during, and after World War II. It proposed to transfer responsibility for the security of the Straits from Turkey to a Turkish-Soviet condominium which would have given the Soviets military bases at the Straits. This return to the historical Russian desire to control the Straits inevitably elicited firm opposition from Turkey, Great Britain, and the United States. Soviet pressure on Turkey in the postwar years impelled the United States to become involved in the eastern Mediterranean, thus helping to establish the pattern of the Cold War.²⁶ Even today, Turkey chafes under the Montreux provisions which deprive it of the right to restrict commercial traffic through the Straits.²⁷ Successful management regimes chafe, but rarely raise blisters.

The Prevention of Incidents at Sea Agreement.

The Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Prevention of Incidents On and Over the High Seas (INCSEA), signed on May 25, 1972, by Secretary of the Navy John Warner and Admiral of the Fleet Sergei Gorshkov, differs from the Lausanne and Montreux Conventions in many dimensions. A bilateral executive agreement between the U.S. and Soviet Navies rather than a formal treaty, it remained in effect for only 16 years before it was replaced by the Prevention of Dangerous Military

Activities Agreement of 1988. It did not address a long-standing major international issue. It encompassed only a narrow aspect of the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union. Within these limits, INCSEA achieved its objectives.

The expanding presence and increasing assertiveness of the Soviet Navy created the need for INCSEA. Soviet ships and aircraft often interfered with U.S. naval operations. Because the Soviets were deploying an array of new ships, aircraft, and weapons systems, U.S. ships often approached Soviet units closely to gather intelligence visually. Near misses and collisions, some of which caused the loss of aircraft and casualties, had become frequent. The United States raised the possibility of an agreement to reduce incidents in 1968. The final agreement was straightforward. It required the two navies to obey the standard nautical Rules of the Road, to avoid provocative behaviors, such as simulating attacks on or aiming weapons at each other, to use navigation lights properly, to use signals to warn each other of danger, and to meet annually to review the implementation of the agreement.²⁸

INCSEA established a new pattern of professional interaction among American and Soviet naval officers. It reduced the number of incidents and proved particularly useful during the October 1973 Arab-Israeli War, when both navies had large forces in the eastern Mediterranean and international tension compelled the commanders to jockey for tactical advantages. The two navies came to value the unique service-to-service relationship and to resent outside interference in it. During the tense period of the early 1980s, U.S. warships repeatedly entered what the Soviets considered internal waters in order to demonstrate the principle of freedom of navigation. These incursions led to a number of naval confrontations which the INCSEA annual reviews helped to resolve. When Soviet units interfered with U.S. salvage operations in international waters after the destruction of Korean Air Lines Flight 007, the United States invoked INCSEA to demand that the Soviets end their harassment, and they complied. When the United States temporarily terminated official contacts with the Soviet armed forces after the murder of Major Arthur Nicholson in 1985, the decision deeply disturbed Soviet naval officers.²⁹ INCSEA became a model for a bilateral agreement

between the German and Polish navies in 1990, and the United States proposed a multilateral equivalent as part of a comprehensive Middle East settlement in 1992. The U.S. and Chinese navies signed a similar agreement in 1998.³⁰

David Winkler, the leading authority on INCSEA, gives six reasons for its success. Both navies wanted to avoid damage to their ships and aircraft and the possibility of an escalation of tensions or even hostilities as result of accident or imprudence. Because the rapid growth of the Soviet Navy put many inexperienced officers in command positions, this danger concerned the Soviets particularly. The simplicity of INCSEA's terms, the professionalism of those charged with enforcing it, and the practice of discussing violations in advance of the annual review made the review process effective. The social norms established for the review sessions created a positive atmosphere. The low profile of the agreement—which did not require congressional approval and concerned professional military officers primarily—facilitated its success. The provision for direct communications between the navies and the annual reviews made verification far easier than in more elaborate arms control agreements.³¹ INCSEA gave the navies of both countries, especially the insurgent Soviet Union, a growing vested interest in keeping tensions low. This interest certainly would not have prevented them from going to war at the behest of their political masters. It did, however, function as a confidence-building measure, which gradually impressed observers outside of the two navies.

Precedent Conclusions.

The precedents offer a variety of models for the Persian Gulf and Strait of Hormuz, though, of course, none fits precisely. The Lausanne Convention offers the most applicable model for a comprehensive agreement. The primary objection to Lausanne, Turkey's lack of sovereignty over the Straits, would not apply to the Strait of Hormuz because neither Iran nor any other state has claim to sovereignty; the Strait is inherently an international waterway. Demilitarization and international control exercised by an intergovernmental organization devoted to the maintenance of free and secure navigation could

benefit all concerned. A more modest and less visible agreement on the model of INCSEA, reducing local tensions and the probability of provocative incidents, would have similar advantages on a smaller scale. Many possibilities exist between the two extremes.

MANAGEMENT IN THE PERSIAN GULF AND STRAIT OF HORMUZ

Several different variables define the matrix of possible management regimes. In addition to the diversity in the scope and diplomatic formality suggested by the precedents, the geographic compass of an agreement could vary from the Strait of Hormuz alone to the entire Gulf and its littoral. The United States thus has a wide range of options from which to select a management regime to meet the fail-safe criteria. In proposing and, perhaps, implementing the regime, the United States would have the initiative and significant strategic advantages. The establishment of a management arrangement for the Gulf or Strait, properly done, would be an opportunity to turn military capability into diplomatic advantage, not an offer of concessions for returns which may prove ephemeral.

The strategic advantages are inherent in the power relationship between a global maritime power and an insular regional power. The military leverage of the United States comes, most importantly, from the ability to interdict Iranian shipping outside the Strait of Hormuz, in the Gulf of Oman or Arabian Sea, and to conduct effective strikes against Iran from outside the region. No agreement restricted to the Gulf and its littoral would affect those capabilities. Though Iran's military capabilities threaten U.S. interests, there is little doubt that U.S. capabilities pose a greater threat to the Islamic Republic. This fact makes it possible for a management regime to meet the fail-safe criteria because it creates the possibility of a quid pro quo with the Iranian regime which does not harm U.S. interests.

In the context of the Gulf, the United States has a narrow agenda: the protection of the production and export of petroleum and natural gas, and the reduction of the protection costs paid for them.³² We are free to pursue those objectives as long as we do not compromise other broader objectives, as would happen, for example, if a management

regime restricted the U.S. ability to take whatever actions deemed necessary to deal with the Iranian nuclear program. A pledge not to attack Iranian nuclear facilities in exchange for an Iranian pledge not to block the Strait, for example, would not be acceptable; it would guarantee the success of Iran's conventional deterrent. The United States could, however, promise not to interfere with Iranian shipping within the Gulf and Strait or attack Iranian oil and natural gas facilities, onshore and offshore, in return for an Iranian pledge not to attack shipping or the oil and gas facilities of other Gulf states. By reducing the probability of attack, this type of agreement would have a direct impact on prices by reducing insurance premiums, even it had no other effect. Such an agreement would prohibit attack on Iran's most important economic assets, but it appears so unlikely that the United State would choose to do so under any circumstances that the prohibition appears acceptable.

U.S. military action against Iran might have one of four general purposes: preemption, punishment, rollback of aggression or provocation, or regime change. Preemptive or small scale punitive operations probably would consist either of precision guided munitions, or possibly, the insertion and extraction of special operations forces to destroy specific military or paramilitary targets. The Israeli attacks on the Osiraq reactor in 1981 and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) headquarters in Tunis in 1985; Operation EL DORADO CANYON against Libya in 1986; the 1998 cruise missile strikes against targets in Afghanistan and the Sudan; and commando operations like the Israeli, German, and French hostage rescue operations at Entebbe, Uganda in 1976; Mogadishu, Somalia in 1977; and Kolwezi, Zaire in 1978, exemplify this type of mission. Only if the Islamic Republic used oil and gas facilities to shield other activities, which the large number of non-Iranians involved in the petroleum industry makes unlikely, would a prohibition on attacking them interfere with this type of operation.

Iran's conventional military weakness makes the type of aggression or intervention which would require a punitive response comparable to Operation DESERT STORM highly unlikely. Without considering either the probability or the desirability of a military intervention to change the Iranian regime, such an operation would

not target the energy facilities. Energy resources and facilities form an important component of national power, as Ray Cline's methodology for assessing national power indicates.³³ But regime change operations, after all, seek to overthrow governments, not conquer nations. Iraqi oil facilities were not, and Iranian facilities are not, the centers of gravity of the regime. Clausewitz presents the concept of center of gravity thus: "One must keep the dominant characteristics of both belligerents in mind. Out of the characteristics, a certain center of gravity develops, the hub of all power and movement, on which everything depends. That is the point against which all our energies must be directed."³⁴ John Warden relies on this concept as the organizing principle of his analysis of air warfare.³⁵ The Islamic Republic's center of gravity consists of the mechanisms of political coercion which keep it in power, not the economic resources of the country in general. Attacking oil facilities also has inherent environmental risks. The United States thus could surrender the option of attacking Iranian oil facilities without violating the fail-safe criteria.

To Iran, the proposition would appear less favorable, because the ability to interfere with traffic in the Strait is not only the keystone of Iran's conventional deterrence but also a major source of Iran's regional leverage. Iran might well reject such a proposal, whatever diplomatic form it took. It would, however, do so at the cost of appearing of intransigent, globally and regionally. An Iranian rejection would imply that Iran considered blocking the Strait and attacking its neighbors' shipping and energy facilities an option, which the other Gulf countries would hardly welcome.³⁶

This discussion of a no-attack pledge suggests ways in which even the proposal of a management regime could serve American interests. Other initiatives could have similar effects. Narrowing the geographic range of the proposed regime to the Strait and drawing on the Lausanne precedent raises the possibility of a local demilitarization. There would be some advantage, however, in an agreement which simply moved Iranian forces away from the Strait. Iranian control of the disputed islands of Abu Musa, the Great Tunbs, and the Lesser Tunbs, some 50 kilometers west of the Strait, and undisputed Sirri Island further west, offer it a definite advantage in

closing the Strait, though not a militarily decisive one.³⁷ Given the short distances involved, Iran could fire antishipping missiles or conduct special operations with small craft from bases on the mainland.³⁸ A territorial arms control agreement or demilitarized zone would have to extend well beyond the Strait to deny Iran the ability to interdict traffic in the Strait. If it did so, it would encompass the major Iranian naval base at Bandar Abbas and the entire territory of several of the emirates of the United Arab Emirates (UAE). But the elimination of military forces from the Strait and their immediate environs, even if only the islands and the tip of the Musandam Peninsula—part of Oman, which the United States could probably prevail upon to cooperate—would make it harder for Iran to interfere with Strait traffic without preparation, and easier for the United States to detect and respond to Iranian actions. But the demilitarization of Omani territory would hardly be an incentive for Iran and, from the Iranian perspective hardly a concession for the United States. The most relevant form of concession would resemble some of the restrictions on passage through the Turkish Straits.

The United States could accept restrictions as long as they did not interfere significantly with military operations in the Gulf. Restrictions on the total number or size of vessels inside the Gulf would not be acceptable; a requirement for formal notice of passage would be. A requirement that submarines pass through the Strait only on the surface would interfere with U.S. submarine operations there. The United States began operating submarines inside the Gulf only when Iran acquired advanced conventional submarines from Russia, suggesting that submarines may have an important force protection role.³⁹ Even so, the passage restriction might be acceptable. Iranian naval power in the region depends far more on its small submarine forces than the United States does on submarines. Restrictions on passage also could include the prohibition of ships and aircraft carrying mines through the demilitarized zone.

Whether included in a broader demilitarization agreement or not, a prohibition of mines in the Strait area or in the entire Gulf would be a useful management instrument. As the damage to the *Bridgeton* and *USS Samuel B. Roberts* during the 1987-88 tanker war demonstrates, mines pose a significant hazard to Gulf shipping, especially if laid

clandestinely. The removal of this threat would reduce uncertainty about navigation substantially.⁴⁰ Since Iran is the only Gulf state likely to employ mines, it would probably not be difficult to get the remainder of the Gulf states and outside navies operating in the Gulf to agree to a comprehensive regional ban on naval mines.

The disputed islands present another option, but unfortunately not a desirable one. The islands have small populations and no intrinsic worth beyond their location. Under the territorial arrangements established when Britain withdrew from the Gulf in 1971, Iran was to share sovereignty over Abu Musa and the Tunbs with the UAE. Just before the British withdrew; Iranian forces occupied all three islands. Iran and the UAE reached an agreement for joint administration just before the Iranian occupation; there was no such agreement with the UAE. The joint administration of Abu Musa has led to friction, notably since 1992 when Iran began to assert unilateral control over the island. There have been a number of incidents since that time; in June 2004, for example, a UAE patrol boat fired on an Iranian fishing boat. The UAE, backed by the other members of the GCC, have sought international arbitration to resolve the situation; Iran has refused.⁴¹ Iranian overtures to the Gulf countries have not altered their position.⁴² Even the mention of the most basic agreement regarding the islands, presumably exchanging recognition of Iranian sovereignty for demilitarization, would deeply offend the Gulf Arabs and encourage Iranian territorial claims elsewhere in the Gulf. Iran asserted a historical claim to Bahrain, originally in 1927, but officially relinquished that claim in 1970. Recognition of the Iranian claims to the Tunbs and Abu Musa might encourage Iran to revive the claim to Bahrain.⁴³ Since Iran has controlled the Tunbs for 30 years and apparently has obtained what it wants in Abu Musa, the island situation appears to offer little leverage for obtaining concessions from Iran. For Iran, the islands are a national issue, not related to the revolutionary agenda.⁴⁴

The INCSEA precedent suggests a different management approach, focused on freedom of navigation and avoidance of provocation. Like INCSEA, an "INCGULF" could involve only actual armed forces (air and naval) operating in the Gulf and Strait and would regulate only behavior. It could begin with a promise

to observe the maritime rules of the road and their equivalents in the air and continue by circumscribing provocative behaviors, such as the loading of mines aboard ships or aircraft or the use of missile guidance radars, and might extend to notice of naval and air exercises. The lack of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Islamic Republic would be an obstacle to the negotiation of such an agreement, particularly if it involved the creation of a review body. But the United States and Iran already cooperate in a program for the monitoring of wrecks and other hazards to navigation in the Strait, managed by the U.S. Coast Guard; anecdotal reports suggest that formal and respectful contacts frequently take place between U.S. and Iranian naval officers in the Strait area. A Prevention of Incidents structure simply would place those contacts on an ongoing basis without involving interaction at the diplomatic level. It would improve the security of traffic through Strait and thus appeal not only to the other Gulf states and the United States, but to all major importers of oil from the Gulf, including India and China. The Iranian Revolutionary Guard, essentially the armed forces of the revolutionary agenda, probably would reject an INCGULF out of hand. The rejection would both isolate Iran and contribute to friction between the regular Iranian armed forces and the Revolutionary Guard.

The idea of a Gulf commission, modeled up to a point on the Strait Commission established in the Lausanne Convention, offers an intriguing prospect. (The Strait Commission could not be an exact model, since it was imposed by the victorious Allies and actually controlled its own territory, the Strait Zone.) A Gulf Commission would address the question of secure and orderly navigation in the international waters of the Strait and Gulf. It would be established by an international convention and have responsibility for enforcing the terms of that convention. A Gulf convention could include any of the possible agreements mentioned above—local demilitarization, a mine ban, an INCGULF, for example—as well as such matters as maintenance of aids to navigation and wrecks, on which anecdotal evidence suggests that there is already a good deal of informal cooperation. It also could serve as a clearing house for information on the passage of ships and aircraft. More formal and intrusive

mechanisms of management could include requiring that an official of the Commission be aboard all nonriparian vessels and all warships operating in international waters in the Gulf, or even that ships passing through the waters administered by the Commission fly a Commission flag in addition to their national colors. The expenses of the Commission would be considerable; it could be funded either by fees paid by the users of the Gulf or contributions from the members of the Commission.

Since it is impossible to bring surface ships into the Gulf surreptitiously, the functioning of a Commission would not limit U.S. military options significantly. If a situation justified military action, it would also justify violating the rules of the commission. The convention which created the commission would have to have an escape clause to deal with this circumstance. It also might declare certain violations of the convention as acts of war against the signatories. Such a structure would give the United States a legal role in maintaining the security of Gulf. The establishment of a commission thus would defeat Iran's longstanding goal of establishing a collective security structure in the Gulf which would exclude the United States. An Iranian rejection of an agreement would imply that Iran valued its national interest above order and security in the Gulf, and thus isolate Iran.⁴⁵

Even if these initiatives turned out to be no more than diplomatic theater, the United States still would benefit. Thus far, the United States has dealt with Iran's nuclear program primarily with sanctions and harsh rhetoric, unlike the European Union (EU), which has offered positive incentives.⁴⁶ The proposal of management instruments or regimes for the Gulf would show flexibility without altering policy on the nuclear issue. Even if the flexibility is not sufficient to impress the Islamic Republic, it would impress the global community and might facilitate cooperation with the European powers on nuclear issues and continuing security cooperation with the GCC countries. If, of course, Iran accepted one of the proposals and then violated it, it would weaken Iran's position, even if it were not so gross a provocation as Saddam's invasion of Kuwait. In either of these cases, the United States would benefit as long our adherence to whatever instrument or regime Iran had violated did not compromise our ability to act in the Gulf.

Showing flexibility to the Islamic Republic would have some risks. Iran might take plasticity as weakness and take more aggressive actions as a result. But in doing so, the Islamic Republic would weaken its international position. Iranian adherence to an agreement might well pose the greatest challenge. Iranian acceptance of a management instrument for the Gulf would be as much a strategic choice as offering it would be for the United States. If the GCC countries, Iran's other neighbors, and the world community (not to mention the United States) perceived Iranian acceptance of a management as a sign of a new and more benign approach to the world, and acted accordingly, the situation would become far more dangerous. A reduction in tensions in the Gulf cannot and must not serve as the basis for a redefinition of the U.S. relationship with the Islamic Republic. It could not replace, only complement the sanctions regime and a vigorous military policy in the region. Whatever confidence these measures might build could not become the basis of a new Gulf policy.⁴⁷

CONCLUSION

No management instrument or regime could either dissuade the Islamic Republic of Iran from its pursuit of nuclear weapons or eliminate the threat to global and regional order which a nuclear Iran would pose. The most comprehensive and formal concept would offer no more than a marginal improvement in the overall situation. But in such a serious situation, even the prospect of marginal improvement is worth careful investigation. An approach to Iran, whether through secret diplomacy or open declaration, would create a new arena in which the United States could employ its power to reduce Iran's international support and freedom of action and, perhaps, capability. A management regime can be, and must be, an instrument of statecraft, not a substitute for it.

ENDNOTES - CHAPTER 11

1. Richard N. Haass, *Conflicts Unending: the United States and Regional Disputes*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990, pp. 1-2.

2. Dagobert Brito and Amy Jaffe, "Reducing Vulnerability of the Strait of Hormuz," chap. 9, this volume.

3. On this point, see, for example, Philip C. Saunders, "Military Options for Dealing with North Korea's Nuclear Program," Monterey Institute of International Studies, January 27, 2003, available at <http://cns.miis.edu/research/korea/dprkmil.htm>.

4. Anthony H. Cordesman, *Iran's Evolving Military Forces*, Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2004, p. 42; *idem.*, *Iran's Military Forces in Transition*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999, covers the Iranian military forces at greater length.

5. Numerous authors on nuclear issues have quoted Sundarji's words, but I have been unable to locate the original source in which they appeared. For wording, see Keith B. Payne, *Deterrence in the Second Nuclear Age*, Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1996, p.20.

6. On the continuity of Iranian foreign policy, see Graham E. Fuller, *The "Center of the Universe": The Geopolitics of Iran*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1991, esp. pp. 8-33.

7. On Iran's nuclear ambitions in regional context, see *ibid.*, p. 237.

8. Mihael Eisenstadt, "Living with a Nuclear Iran," in *Crises in the Contemporary Persian Gulf*, Barry Rubin, ed., London and Portland, OR: Frank Cass, 2002, p. 227.

9. On these issues, see Fuller, *ibid.*; Christin Marschall, *Iran's Persian Gulf Policy: From Khomeini to Khatami*, New York: Routledge Curzon, 2003, pp. 3-62; Anthony H. Cordesman, *Iran's Military Forces in Transition*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999, pp. 20-30, 265-270. Robin Wright, "Desire for Nuclear Empowerment a Uniting Factor in Iran," *Washington Post*, November 14, 2004, demonstrates the Iranian desire for nuclear capability.

10. The reference to containment does not imply an acceptance of the Iranian regime as permanent or desirable, but to containment as a prerequisite for any other policy to deal with the Iranian regime.

11. Cordesman, *Iran's Evolving Military Forces*, http://csis.org/features/0407_IranMilForces.pdf, p. 18. Cordesman summarizes reports on Iranian nuclear programs on pp. 49-60.

12. Iran's ability to close the Strait might be said to constitute a Samson option, comparable to Israeli nuclear capability as described in Seymour Hersh, *The Samson Option: Israel's Nuclear Arsenal and American Foreign Policy*, New York: Random House, 1991.

13. On the Mossadeq era, see Sephehr Zabih, *The Mossadeq Era: Roots of Iranian Revolution*, Chicago: Lake View Press, 1986; Mostafa Elm, *Iran's Oil Nationalization and Its Aftermath*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1992, among others. With the exception of Zabih, nearly all the literature on Mossadeq and his time overestimates the degree of popular support for Mossadeq, the stability of his government, and his commitment to free and representative government, and underestimates the Communist threat to and within Iran.

14. For a recent survey of political patterns in the GCC countries other than Saudi Arabia, see Malcolm C. Peck, "Eastern Arabian States; Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, and Oman," David E. Long and Bernard Reich, *The Government and Politics of the Middle East and North Africa*, 4th. Ed., Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2002, pp. 128-173. Political liberalization in Qatar led to the establishment of al-Jazeera.

15. James H. Noyes, *The Clouded Lens: Persian Gulf Security and US Policy*, Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1982, covers the early years of U.S. Gulf policy. Anthony Cordesman has continued the story in a series of volumes, including *The Gulf and the Search for Strategic Stability*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1984; *The Gulf and the West: Strategic Relations and Military Realities*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1988; and *After the Storm: the Changing Military Balance in the Middle East*, Boulder, CO: Westview, 1993. There is also M. E. Ahrari and James H. Noyes, eds., *The Persian Gulf After the Cold War*, Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993, and Michael A. Palmer, *Guardians of the Gulf: A History of America's Expanding Role in the Persian Gulf, 1833-1992*, New York: Free Press, 1992.

16. *The Oxford Dictionary of Quotations*, 3rd. ed., New York Oxford University Press, 1979, attributes this verse to G. W. Hunt, and describes it as the lyrics of a "Music Hall Song."

17. Any mention of the "Great Game" justifies citing Peter Hopkirk's superb *The Great Game: the Struggle for Empire in Central Asia*, New York: Kondansha International, 1994.

18. On the Straits question in the 19th century, see Harry N. Howard, *Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974, pp. 1-27; Christos L. Rozakis and Petros N. Stagos, *The Turkish Straits*, Dordrecht, Holland: Maritnus Nijhoff, 1987, pp. 1-24, 80-89; Ferenc A. Vali, *The Turkish Straits and NATO*, Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1972, pp. 3-25; William Hale, *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1174-2000*, London: Frank Cass, 2000, pp. 13-37. This list, and subsequent lists of sources on the Straits question, is hardly exhaustive.

19. On the Straits question during World War I, see Howard, *Turkey*, pp. 27-45; Rozakis and Stagos, *Turkish Straits*, pp. 25-31; Vali, *Turkish Straits*, pp. 26-29; Hale, *Foreign Policy*, pp. 37-44; David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*, New York: Avon, 1990, especially pp. 137-145, 189-199. These references are hardly comprehensive and do not deal with the Dardanelles expedition at all.

20. On Sevres and Lausanne, see Howard, *Turkey*, pp. 51-129; Vali, *Turkish Straits*, pp. 26-34; Rozakis and Stagos, *Turkish Straits*, pp. 26-39, 89-100, Anthony R. DeLuca, *Great Power Rivalry in the Turkish Straits*, Boulder, CO: East European Monographs, 1981, pp. 1-14; Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace*, pp. 427-434, 465-568.

21. *Ibid.*

22. On the terms of the Convention of Lausanne, see Petros and Rozakis, *Turkish Straits*, pp. 89-100; Howard, *Turkey*, pp. 83-129, 300-313.

23. Howard, *Turkey*, pp. 126-147; Rozakis and Stagos, *Turkish Straits*, pp. 36-42; DeLuca, *Rivalry*, pp. 14-50.
24. Lord Stanhope, the leader of the British delegation at the beginning of the conference, used this phrase. *Actes de la Conference de Montreux: 22-Juin-20 Juillet: Compte Rendu des Seances Plenieres et Proces-Verbal Des Debats du Comite Technique*, with an introduction by Thanassis Aghnides, Paris: 1936, p. 43, quoted in DeLuca, *Rivalry*, p. 56.
25. On the negotiations and general framework of the Montreux Convention, see Howard, *Straits*, pp. 147-156; Rozakis and Stagos, pp. 102-104; Vali, *Straits*, pp. 36-40; DeLuca, *Rivalry*, pp. 25-135. On the specific provisions, see Howard, *Straits*, pp. 292-315; Rozakis and Stagos, *Straits*, pp. 104-136. The Convention's provisions regarding aircraft carriers are not clear. Because the text of the Convention makes no reference to aircraft carriers but refers only to capital ships and Annex II specifically excludes aircraft carriers from the category of capital ships, it appears that aircraft carriers are subject to the 15,000 ton limit, which effectively prohibits them from passing through the Strait. At least partially, if not entirely, because of this issue, the Soviet Union designated all of its aircraft carriers, which were constructed at Nikolayev in the Ukraine for use outside the Black Sea, as cruisers, which qualified as capital ships under the Convention, rather than aircraft carriers. Article 15 states "Vessels of war in transit through the Strait shall in no circumstances make use of any aircraft which they may be carrying," thus prohibiting the use of aircraft during transit but not their carriage. On these issues, see Rozakis and Stagos, *ibid.*, pp. 50-55, 132-133.
26. Bruce R. Kuniholm, *The Origins of the Cold War in the Near East: Great Power Conflict and Diplomacy in Iran, Turkey and Greece*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980, provides an excellent overview of this topic; Harry N. Howard, *Turkey, the Straits and U.S. Policy*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974, pp. 210-280, covers the issue of the Strait in detail.
27. On this issue, see, for example, Christopher Slaney, "Turkish Concern for Bosphorus Complicates Oil Transport Scenarios," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, Vol. XXII, No. 4, May 2004.
28. David F. Winkler, *Cold War at Sea: High-Seas Confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union*, Annapolis, MD: U.S. Naval Institute, 2000, discusses the historical background of INCSEA and the negotiation which led up to it on pp. 1-107, and summarizes the terms on pp. 106-107. Significantly, INCSEA did not address collisions or other incidents involving submerged submarines.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 108-176, esp. pp. 129-130, 146-147, 150-151.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 170-171.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 172-175.
32. Frederick C. Lane developed the concept of protection costs. For a collection of his articles on this point, see *Profits from Power: Readings in Protection Rent and Violence Controlling Enterprises*, Albany: State University of New York Press, 1979.

33. Ray S. Cline, *The Power of Nations in the 1990s: A Strategic Assessment*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994, pp. 29-30, 54-55.
34. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, Michael Howard and Peter Paret, ed. and trans., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976, pp. 595-596.
35. Colonel John A. Warden, USAF, *The Air Campaign*, San Jose, CA: To Excel Press, 2000, pp. 7-10.
36. For a recent report of Iran's continuing efforts to improve relations with the GCC countries, see "Iran's Gulf Inroads," *Eurasia Security Watch*, Vol. 67, January 14, 2005, www.afpc.org/esw67.shtml.
37. I deal with the boundary dispute below.
38. Anthony H. Cordesman, "Iranian Military Capabilities and Dual Containment," in *The Persian Gulf at the Millennium: Essay in Politics, Economy, Society, and Religion*, Gary G. Sick and Lawrence Potter, ed., New York: St. Martin's, 1997, pp. 205-206.
39. Michael Collins Dunn, "The Iranian Submarines: A New Naval Arm," *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, December 1992/January 1993, <http://www.washington-report.org/backissues/1292/9212040.html>.
40. On the tanker war, see Palmer, *Guardians*, pp. 128-149.
41. On the diplomatic history of the dispute over the islands, see Pirouz, Mojtahed-Zadeh, "Iran's Maritime Boundaries in the Persian Gulf: the Case of Abu Musa Island," in *the Boundaries of Modern Iran*, Keith McLachlan, ed., New York: St. Martin's, 1994, pp. 101-127; Richard N. Schofield, "Border Disputes in the Gulf: Past, Present and Future," in *ibid.*, pp. 142-156; *idem.*, "Gulshan Dietl, "Iran in the Emerging Greater Middle East," in *Oil and Water: Cooperative Security in the Persian Gulf*, Bjorn Moller, ed., New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001, pp. 74-75. On the June 2004 incident, see Simon Henderson, *Incident in the Shatt al-Arab Waterway: Iran's Border Sensitivities*, Washington Incident for Near East Policy *Policywatch*, Vol. 879, June 28, 2004, available at www.washingtoninstitute.org/watch/policywatch/policywatch2004/879.htm. Although the Abu Musa incident is not Henderson's actual topic, he provides an admirable summary of it.
42. See the archive of news stories on the islands issue maintained by the UAE Ministry of Information and Culture, at <http://www.uaeinteract.com/news/default.asp?ID=147>.
43. On the Iranian claim to Bahrain, see George Lenczowski, *The Middle East in World Affairs*, 4th ed., Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1980, p. 671.
44. On this point, see "Always and Forever the Persian Gulf," at www.marzeporgohar.org/index.php?l=1&cat=17&scat=31&artid=370. The web site is maintained by Iranians for a Secular Republic.
45. The possibility exists that the regime would actually welcome a strike to strengthen its domestic position, but there is no evidence to support such speculation.

46. Eisenstadt, "Living With a Nuclear Iran," pp. 244-45; this observation remains valid despite the 5 years since Eisenstadt made it. The overtures to Khatami which he mentions have produced nothing.

47. Lawrence G. Potter, "Confidence Building Measures in the Persian Gulf," in *The Persian Gulf at the Millennium*, Gary G. Sick, ed.; and *idem.*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997, pp. 231-248, discuss possible continental ballistic missiles among the Persian Gulf littoral states, but do not propose any arrangement similar to the Convention proposed here.