

5 September 2012

My talk today is on the United States, Iran, and Israel. On this first slide we see a group of Iranian nuclear scientists grouped around the president of Iran. The Iranian nuclear program represents the greatest foreign policy challenge facing the United States today. In this second slide (#2) we see a map of Iran.

In December 2008, I was invited to participate in a conference at the Musgrove Plantation on the lovely island of St. Simon's, Georgia. (Slide #3). It was a Track 2-type conference on Iranian-American relations by the same people from Brown University who earlier had done a post-mortem exercise on the Cuban Missile Crisis, with Americans, Russians, and Cubans mixing it up at several venues, including Havana. In the Musgrove exercise, the participants were a) U.S. and UN officials formerly involved in Iranian affairs, and b) Iranian scholars living in the United States. The hope was to attract additional Iranian scholars from Iran, but this didn't materialize.

The American-Iranian exercise was a one-off. It was supposed to have been followed by a second meeting in Tehran, but somebody cut it off, perhaps even Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmedinejad (Slide #4) I don't know exactly how it was ended, but it was ended. I remember earlier talking to an Iranian friend of mine, Professor Houshang Shehabi of Boston University, and filling him in on what had happened at Musgrove and what our future plans were. He was a little surprised and asked, "Does Ahmedinejad know about this?" (Ahmedijnejad had come into power back in 2005.)

Certain Track-II type efforts are being continued at present (and by Track II we mean non-mainstream or back channel.) These are being carried on principally by Ambassador Tom Pickering, who was one of the participants at the Musgrove Conference,

and by Ambassador William Lueurs. I don't know much about these efforts, but I do know that a main contention of Tom Pickering is that an intermediary trusted by both sides would likely be necessary if meaningful negotiations on a host of issues are to take place between the United States and Iran...the underlying reason behind this is that the distrust on both sides is very, very high, and neither side fully understands the grievances of the other.

The vehicle for getting the dialogue going at Musgrove was the eight-year Iran-Iraq war. Brown University and MIT, who sponsored the Musgrove Conference, prevailed upon the National Security Archive to amass a thick volume of documents dealing with all sides – U.S., UN, Iraq and Iran – some of them open-source but most of them declassified and obtained under the Freedom of Information Act. The idea was that if one could get the two sides – Americans and Iranians – talking about a particular subject – the Iran-Iraq War – this might lead to a fuller dialogue on other subjects and an opening up of the relationship.

A selected transcript of the conference proceedings, as well as some of the most important of the documents, was published a few months ago in a book entitled, "Becoming Enemies: U.S. Iranian Relations and the Iran-Iraq War, 1979-1988." (The war was actually from 1980 to 1988). The book is listed on the web, and for anyone interested in Iranian affairs, I highly recommend it. (Slide #5)

The book is well-titled. In brief, the United States and Iran really did become enemies over the course of the Iran-Iraq War. (Although difficulties between the Americans and the Iranians, or more properly, between the Anglo-Americans and the Iranians, go way back, at least to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century).

What leaps out from the documents that were presented at Musgrove, and from the conversations that took place there, are certain events that demonstrate the extreme bias of the United States against Iran.

Firstly there was the beginning of the Iran-Iraq War itself. There was no American or international condemnation of the Iraqi attack in September 1980. After some length of time the UN Security Council passed a resolution recommending that the two parties cease hostilities and return to the status quo. Saddam Hussein had sought a rectification of the maritime border which had been decided unfavorably for Iraq in an agreement between Saddam and the Shah at Algiers in 1975.

Because of this lack of condemnation of the attack, the Iranians put forward the formula that this was a war imposed on them – imposed by Iraq and behind Iraq, the United States.

Secondly, there was the assistance given by the United States to Iraq during the Iran-Iraq War. Intelligence support on Iranian troop movements, was provided through the CIA. This was, by the Iraqis' own admission, extremely helpful to them. Throughout the war, until near the end when the Iraqis clearly got the upper hand, Washington had been fearful that Iraq would lose, and this would pave the way for an Iranian advance westward, even to the extent of threatening Israel.

Thirdly, the U.S. did not condemn in harsh terms the Iraqi use of chemical weapons against the Iraqi Kurds and later in the war, against Iranian troops in the closing and decisive battles. The Iranians did not use chemical weapons, as for one thing they hadn't fully developed the capability.

While the U.S. had no contact with the Iranians, except later during the war in the cacameni Iran-Contra caper – which was the result of President Reagan’s obsessive desire to free the American hostages in Lebanon, especially the CIA chief Bill Buckley – U.S. diplomats in Baghdad and Washington had close contacts with their Iraqi counterparts. One almost had the impression that Tariq Aziz, the foreign minister, was a member of the State Department, so often did he go there whenever he visited the U.S. (Slide #6)

In 1985, the U.S. got into a sort of quasi-war against Iran in the Persian Gulf in the so-called reflagging exercise, whereby Kuwaiti tankers could move in and out of the Gulf under flags of third countries and escorted by U.S. warships.

By the spring of 1988, the Iraqi Army, resupplied, had finally gotten its act together and, with the use of chemical weapons had gotten the upper hand over the Iranian forces. With the U.S. hostile presence in the Gulf, and the accidental shootdown by the USS Vincennes of an Iranian commercial airliner, which helped convince the Iranians that the U.S. was about to enter the war openly on the side of the Iraqis, the Iranian President, Hashemi Rafsanjani, (Slide #7) convinced Ayatollah Khomeini (Slide #8) to accept the UN cease-fire resolution, which had been voted a year earlier, but which the Iranians had refused to accept unless Iraq was blamed for starting the war. It was in July 1988, when the Iranians finally agreed. Even then the U.S., through an intermediary from Secretary of State George Schultz, his assistant Charles Hill, sought to put off Iraqi acceptance of the cease-fire until October, apparently so the Iraqis could gain more ground. But this stalling attempt didn’t work. The cease-fire went into effect in August 1988 and the war was over.

So you can see by the account I just gave, that the U.S., while officially pretending its neutrality in the war, was doing anything but by its actions. The Iranians were of course

aware of this, and a huge wall of mistrust was built up as a result: the Iranian leadership is still obsessed with the idea that the U.S. wants to effect regime change in Iran, and has been well aware of the existence of U.S. forces nearby, in Iraq, in Afghanistan, and in the Gulf.

Moreover, and this is something the Americans have failed to appreciate, there is a longstanding historical grudge of the Iranians against the Americans. Iran is a special country, an ancient great empire, never formally colonized, but manhandled by Russia and Britain in the early modern era. The Iranian focus on American misdeeds traces back to Operation Four Square in 1953-54, when the CIA -- with the British providing the impetus and the Americans in the lead -- overthrew the elected nationalist government of Mohammed Mossadegh and restored the Shah to power. After that, the Americans played the dominant role in Iraq, and the British stepped back. In 1963, the Ayatollah Khomeini was exiled to Iraq, per the request of the Shah to the Iraqis.

Most Americans, it seems to me, are unaware of this wall of hatred that has risen up in the Iranian establishment against the U.S. The conventional wisdom is something to the contrary, namely that the Iranian people, more so than the Arab masses, have an affection for the American people. Suffice it to say that there is a huge gulf of misunderstanding as well as a lack of sound information on both sides.

Now let's turn to the American grievance against Iran, which, in a sort of parallel to Iranian grievances, is not fully understood in Iran. The American rancor is centered on the Iranian hostage crisis which started in November 1979. The Iranians seem to have taken, at least at the outset, a more light-hearted approach to this affront. In fact there is a sort of back-history to this event. In 1906, a mob of some 20,000 Iranians invaded the grounds of

the British Embassy in Tehran for a period of weeks in an effort to force reforms on the ruling Qajar dynasty. The result was the constitution of 1906. (Slide #9).

There was a sort of reminiscent ring to this in the description of the November 1979 U.S. Embassy takeover by one of the American hostages, Moorehead Kennedy: “They were carrying sticks, but there was not a weapon in sight. It was only afterwards that they pulled out their pistols...The whole image they were trying to convey to us was conveyed by a long streamer held up below the big glass windows in the Ambassador’s office by a bunch of women students who would not be fired on. It read: ‘We do not wish to inconvenience you. All we want is a sit-in.’”

At Musgrove, I was a former official recalling what had happened during the Iran-Iraq War. In the hostage crisis, I was one of the principal actors, as chief of the Near East and South Asia Division in the Directorate of Operations of the CIA. At 3:30 on the morning of November 4, 1979, I got a phone call from my deputy for South Asia who said, “They’re coming over the wall.”

The hostage-taking was unprecedented, or rather, it was preceded. In February 1979, a similar action had been taken, but it was quickly ended. We had an ambassador at the time, William Sullivan, who intervened and the so-called “students” quickly left. There was reason to suppose that the same sequence would take place again.

But something big had happened in the meantime. On the basis of persuasive arguments by David Rockefeller, the White House admitted the cancer-ridden Shah to the United States. (Slide #10) (I might add as an aside that though the Shah was diagnosed with cancer as of about 1972, the U.S. did not become aware of this until about 1976.

The Shah was admitted to the U.S. despite a pointed warning against this by the charge d'affaires, Bruce Laingen, (Slide #11) who had taken over from the departed ambassador William Sullivan. Here is an excerpt from a cable sent by Laingen to Secretary of State Vance on July 28, 1979: "...I conclude that for the Shah to take up residence in the U.S. in the immediate future, by which I mean the next 2-3 months, would continue as before to be seriously prejudicial to our interests and to the security of Americans in Iran..."

I was on an orientation trip to the area in the early fall of 1979, and I had the Chief of Station in Teheran meet me in Saudi Arabia, where I informed him that the Shah was going to be admitted to the U.S. and that he should burn all documents in the Station's possession. He didn't fully accomplish this, and the Iranians, this nation of rug-weavers, later put together some shredded documents that showed in essence that we had been in touch with members of the moderate opposition to the Shah – but only as contacts and not as agents.

The day after the Embassy takeover, the Imam Khomeini publicly supported the action of the so-called student followers of the line of the Imam. Khomeini's position was that no harm would come to the hostages, but they wouldn't be released until Iran's grievances against the U.S. were satisfied. At the same moment the government of the moderate opposition fell, partly because some of them had met with American officials in Algiers. The die was cast: we were faced with a seemingly open-ended seizure of 65 (later 53) American hostages. Incidentally, in the famous photograph of some blindfolded American hostages being held, there is a man on the far right who is outside the frame of this picture and who looks a lot like Mahmoud Ahmadian. (Slide #12) But it is not.

Although Ahmedinejad was with the students in the line of the Imam, he had wanted to invest the Soviet Embassy as well; and because of this disagreement he did not join in the move against the American Embassy.

It was a moment of extreme frustration in Washington. As I wrote in an article ten years later recalling the event, “the unspeakable had been committed by the unseizable.” All sorts of options were advanced willy-nilly. My predecessor as Chief Near East South Asia proposed that a unit of the 82<sup>nd</sup> Airborne make a landing in force at Mehrabad Airport, march to the Embassy, secure the hostages, return to the airport and leave. Other options, including a naval blockade were considered. But in an Administration whose leader, Jimmy Carter, (Slide #13), would later show his talents as a peacemaker, it was decided to attempt to negotiate the release of the hostages – while at the same time preparing a sort of surreptitious entry operation to free the hostages by force. Neither worked, at least until the end of the Carter Administration. (Slide 11)

The Director of Central Intelligence (DCI) at the time was Stansfield Turner, a former admiral who was a Naval Academy classmate of President Carter, although they didn't know each other well. (Slide #14) Shortly after the hostage taking, Ross Perot and a half a dozen colleagues from the firm EDS who had been spirited out of Iran at the time of the Khomeini takeover in February 1979, were invited to the DCI's conference room. I was at Turner's left side, as I was at many other such meetings with American academics who were experts on Iran, as well as others, as we tried to figure out what to do with what I would term as Iran's act of “soft war.” I noticed that the Admiral was drawing little squares on a piece of paper, noting down the names of Ross Perot's colleagues across the table, so

that he could call them by their first names as he asked them to recount their experiences in getting out of Iran.

At the very beginning, as I mentioned a moment ago, the thought was that the February 1979 incident could well be reenacted. We now know after the fact that the hostage-takers expected to remain in the embassy compound only for a couple of days. Within the Carter Administration there were two schools of thought, exemplified by the Secretary of State Cyrus Vance (whose Persian first name was thought in Iran to be a sign of pro-Iranian feelings) (Slide #15) and by the National Security Adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski. (Slide 16) The Vance school, so to speak, held that the hostages would be released after they had served the purposes of the Iranian revolution, and that patient, dogged diplomacy was what was required. The opposite or Brzezinski view, if you will, held that Khomeini would respond to pressure and that U.S. national honor was being flouted. The extreme expression of the Vance school was that a way had to be found so that Khomeini could claim victory in order to achieve the hostages' release. The idea was to let Khomeini believe he had humiliated the United States. Carter was not immune to this view. On January 12, 1980, he passed a message to the Iranian Government through the UN, of which the following is an excerpt:

“The United States understands and sympathizes with the grievances felt by many Iranian citizens concerning the practices of the former regime. The United States is prepared to work out in advance firm understandings on a forum in which those grievances may subsequently be aired, so that the hostages could be released with confidence that those grievances will be heard in an appropriate forum after the release has taken place.”

So the months went by, as the Carter Administration shilly-shallied between on the one hand, negotiations through various intermediaries in an attempt to achieve the release of the hostages -- negotiations which also involved some opposition figures -- and preparations for a surreptitious entry operation to rescue the hostages.

This hostage rescue operation of April 1980 was conducted without the mechanisms of coordination that had been worked out by the time of the Abbottabad operation targeted against Osama bin Laden in May 2011, thirty years later. (Slide #17). As Admiral William McRaven, who was head of the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC), at the time, stated, “The bin Laden operation would simply not have been possible if CIA and JSOC had not spent a decade in bed together.”<sup>i</sup> Desert One, as it came to be called, was, right from its conception, complicated and hybrid; and, in a certain sense ambiguous.<sup>ii</sup> Like Abbottabad, it was a question of the insertion of a commando force into foreign territory, and in this case enemy territory: Iran. However the Iranian air force and air defenses did not match those of Pakistan in 2011. Desert One was an operation stemming from a situation of a much lower level of provocation. Nearly 3,000 people killed by the orders of a single man, Osama bin Laden, on the one hand, and the sequestration of 53 diplomatic personnel at the American Embassy in Tehran on the other.

In the case of Desert One, a surreptitious operation to free the hostages was seen as preferable and less drastic than an outright declaration of war. It followed from this and from the overall mindset of the Administration of Jimmy Carter, that the operation was put together in such a way that at any stage in the incursion it could be called off and the force withdrawn. That, conceptually, was its fatal flaw.

The hybrid nature of the Desert One operation was evident in the diffuse involvement of the elements of the U.S. military. The hostage rescue force, the Delta Force, was from the Army. The transport aircraft, (EC-130) were from the Air Force. The helicopters (RH53D) were from the Navy but piloted mostly by Marines because Navy pilots were not used to flying long distances over land. The helicopters were of the same make as those used by the Marines but of a later model, with which the Marines were not totally familiar, and this would become one of the crucial factors in the failure of the operation.

The helicopters were not capable of flying from the aircraft carrier Nimitz on the Arabian Sea all the way to Tehran. They had to be refueled at a small improvised airstrip 600 miles from the Nimitz, but still far away from Tehran. This airstrip was reconnoitered by the CIA. The refueling had to be accomplished by C-130's taking off from Masirah Island, in Oman, some 1,000 miles from this improvised airstrip. The C-130's also had to bring in the men of the intervention unit, the Delta Force. The landing area had to be capable of supporting the weight of the C-130's, some of which had to bring in fuel bladders for the refueling, was called Desert One, which became the nickname for this ill-fated operation.

From Desert One, Delta Force had to be taken by the helicopters to a hiding area some 50 miles southeast of Tehran. Then, after having left off the Delta Force, the helicopters had to go to another hiding area nearby.

The CIA, responsible for the arrangements inside Iran, had the job of getting together the trucks and drivers who would bring Delta Force in the middle of night from the hiding area to the Embassy, located in the middle of Tehran. After having recovered the hostages, under the aerial protection, if need be, of AC-130 gunships, the helicopters, having arrived in a nearby stadium, had to take them, along with the Delta Force, to an abandoned airstrip southwest of

Tehran at Manzariyeh, which would have been occupied in the meantime by Rangers. From there, everyone would have been loaded into large C-141 transports for evacuation to Egypt, with the helicopters having been left behind.

The CIA also had the mission of obtaining intelligence inside Iran and in particular on the situation of the hostages and the exact place of their detention. But shortly before the start of the operation, Special Forces sent one of their former officers, Maj. Dick Meadows, into Tehran accompanied by several Special Forces soldiers, in order to verify the information of the CIA. This was in part due to the lack of confidence between the military on the one hand and the civilians of the CIA on the other.

By chance, the cook at the Embassy, a Pakistani, had left Iran shortly before the operation was launched. He reported that all the hostages were located in the chancery building. (The Embassy compound included a number of buildings spread over several hectares). This information, obtained by the CIA, was key. However, the military were not very impressed. They had been disappointed by the failure of the CIA until that point to pinpoint the location of the hostages and the circumstances of their detention.

On April 24, 1980, eight helicopters took off from the deck of the Nimitz headed for Desert One. Problems with the helicopters were not anticipated, although Col. Beckwith, the commander of the Delta Force, had asked that 10 helicopters be put at his disposition instead of eight. (The estimate was that six was the minimum number required to conduct the operation). For various reasons, including a dust storm, the number of helicopters was reduced to six by the time of arrival at Desert One. The follow-on phase was readied, but at the moment when Delta Force, having arrived in the C-130's, was preparing to embark on the helicopters, it was discovered that in one of them there was a fault in the secondary hydraulic system. The question

then arose as to whether to continue the operation. With various services represented at Desert One, the only one who could have made a clear-cut decision was Gen. James Vaught, the commander of the Task Force, but he was far away, at Wadi Seidna, in Egypt. In the end the White House called off the operation.

However, in the course of the evacuation of Desert One, one of the helicopters crashed into a C-130, an explosion took place, and eight military personnel were killed. (Slide #18). The wounded were evacuated but the dead, as well as the helicopters, were left behind. The balance-sheet was a total failure.

President Carter courageously accepted total responsibility for the failed operation. The Congress, and particularly the members of the intelligence oversight committees in the Senate and the House, who had not been informed beforehand, severely criticized the conduct of the operation. The Carter Administration named a commission of inquiry headed by Admiral James L. Holloway. The report of the commission criticized especially the lack of centralization in the planning of the operation and in particular the insufficient number of helicopters, which was the specific cause of the failure.

The opinion of an intelligence officer within the Task Force appears to be worthy of consideration:

Although it is easy to say in hindsight, the bottom line is that a daring commander in wartime could have and would have continued with five or even four helicopters.

Beckwith was a fine Special Forces soldier, but his country was not at war, and his airlift had demonstrated a tendency to break before the first shot was fired. In the middle of the desert, far behind his envisioned time line, and doubtless already concerned about his transportation going into a hide site laager that had never been walked by friendly

feet or seen up close by friendly eyes, he sought reassurance from a tired helicopter pilot and a frustrated airfield manager. And he didn't get it. Nor did Maj. Gen. Vaught order the mission to go forward; and neither did the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary of Defense or the President.

The legislation that followed in 1986, that is, the Goldwater-Nichols Act, changed everything. Goldwater-Nichols spelled the end of the large independence which the various branches of service (Army, Navy, etc.) had enjoyed, and it also strengthened the role of the Chairman of the JCS. From then on, the emphasis was on joint operations. The subsequent Cohen-Nunn Act involved the reorganization and the consolidation of all the Special Forces, that is, the Special Forces of the Army, the Navy *Seals* and other Navy elements, and the Air Force's air commandos. All these units were regrouped under a sole command called the United States Special Operations Command ("USSOCOM"). (A Marine element was subsequently added to this command). The USSOCOM commander has under him all the Special Operations Forces (SOF) in the United States and furnishes units to the commanders of the geographic commands.

What I have tried to establish so far is the huge gulf of distrust that has been built up between the United States and Iran. The U.S. grievance is centered on the hostage crisis of 1979-1980, when the Iranians set up a sort of soft war scenario by sequestering the hostages, and the U.S., led by a pacifist-inclined President, didn't know how to react and when it did militarily, it failed. So it was not only the exasperation on the U.S. side as to how to react to the Iranian provocation, it was also the shame of one of the worst, if not the worst, failed operation in U.S. history. Neither side was fully aware of the depth of hatred of the other, which was the major element that the Musgrove conference brought out.

Four years after the end of the Iran-Iraq War, the Iranian secret atomic effort was exposed<sup>iii</sup>. Iran evaded answering questions about it, and when the United Nations Security Council ordered an end to Iran's enrichment of uranium, Iran refused, and the first of four rounds of sanctions were applied against Iran.

Part of the problem is that, although the Security Council prohibited enrichment, the treaty on which action against Iran is based, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has a loophole in it. The Treaty does not prohibit enrichment nor the level to which enrichment may be carried out. It only prohibits the signatories to the treaty from turning uranium enrichment into military use. The Iranians insist they are only using uranium for reactors, not for nuclear bombs. Their actions suggest otherwise, however. (It is worth noting in this context that the Iranians have a concept, *takiya*, which states that it is a virtue to dissimulate when you are up against a superior enemy.)

Iran upped the ante in 2010 by announcing it would enrich uranium from five per cent to 20 per cent – which was close to military use, generally considered to be 90 per cent -- while insisting this was for a research reactor in Tehran. In 2011, Iran announced that it would triple the amount of uranium enriched to 20 per cent and would gradually move the operation to an underground facility at Fordow, near the holy city of Qom.

When Yukiya Amano, (Slide #19) the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) expressed concerns about the Iranian nuclear energy program, negotiations resumed in 2012 between Iran, in the person of the chief negotiator, Saeed Jalili (Slide #20) and the five members of the Security Council plus Germany, with the European Union's foreign representative, Catherine Ashton, as the point person. (Slide #21). Three fruitless meetings have been held so far at the policy level, with the Iranians demanding a declaration that they

have a right to enrich uranium, and the other side seeking to move the Iranians' stock of 20 per cent enriched uranium out of the country, plus obtaining permission for the IAEA to inspect Fordow. The result has been, so far, a standoff.

Remaining in the background, but very much a factor in U.S. policy toward Iran, is the government of Israel. Since 2005, Mahmoud Ahmedinejad has produced a steady stream of invective against Israel, in part to curry favor with the Arab audiences who are basically not well disposed toward Iranians. One could ask the question, were it not for this over-the-top rhetoric, would the Iran nuclear issue reached such a level of intensity as it has between Iran and the West?

Obviously, because of the past history of the Jewish people, and especially because of the Holocaust, Israeli leaders cannot simply ignore the threats of Ahmedinejad to wipe Israel off the map. (This threat, on at least one occasion, has been seconded by Iran's supreme leader, Ali Khamenei.) Israel has declared itself threatened existentially. Prime Minister Netanyahu has countered with an extremely aggressive rhetoric against Iran. (Slide #22). And Defense Minister Ehud Barak has spoken publicly of a "zone of immunity" at the end of which, the enrichment process having been transferred to the site at Fordow, which is buried in a mountain, the Iranian nuclear program will be invulnerable to air attack...the implication being that Iran's facilities should be struck before that moment. (Slide #23).

In the meantime, four Iranian nuclear scientists have been assassinated, apparently carried out by Mossad using Iranian Jewish agents, according to a book published this summer by two Israeli writers, entitled, "Spies Against Armageddon." Then there was the Olympic Games operation, of which the Stuxnet and Flame malware have allegedly been a part, according to some press reports. This operation has been all but openly admitted as a joint U.S.-

Israeli operation consisting of multiple cyber attacks against Iranian centrifuges at the Natanz plant.<sup>iv</sup> (End Note: NYT Book Review, 11 July 2012, p. 11) The operation was successful but so, apparently, was the Iranian recovery from it. These Israeli actions may have precipitated Iranian-sponsored attacks against Israeli citizens in New Delhi and, more recently, in Bulgaria.

On August 30, the IAEA issued its last quarterly report before the American presidential election in November. The report stated that Iran had in the previous three months installed more than 1,000 centrifuges at the underground Fordow plant outside the Holy City of Qom. This amount alone was double the previous amount at the site. Iran has now installed 2,100 of the roughly 2,800 centrifuges destined for the site. The report also stated that the Iranians have sanitized, that is, cleaned up, another site, Parchin, which the Agency suspected had been involved in experiments related to the development of a nuclear weapon. The IAEA report can only have the effect of intensifying pressure in Israel for an attack on Iran's nuclear sites. However, international legitimacy for such an attack remains a problem, as evidenced by the fact that on August 31, the Nonaligned Movement of 120 member countries, meeting in Tehran, unanimously decreed support for Iran's nuclear energy program and criticized the American-led attempt to isolate Iran with unilateral economic sanctions.

---

<sup>i</sup> *Time*, 7 May 2012, p. 36.

<sup>ii</sup> NDLR: The account of the Desert One operation that follows in this article has been drawn from the author's "Desert One and its Disappointments", *Journal of Military History*, January 1993.

<sup>iii</sup> *The New York Times*, Sunday Review, 17 June 2002, p. 4.

<sup>iv</sup> *Ibid.*, Book Review, 11 July 2012, p. 11.