

Sanctions on Iran. What are the Implications?

By [Ali Fathollah-Nejad](#)

Global Research, March 16, 2010

16 March 2010

Theme: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

The prospects for democracy, socio-economic development, and conflict resolution will suffer if the West continues to rely on punitive measures

This time, [the warmongers' silly season](#) found its apogée in U.S. neo-conservative [Daniel Pipes' advice to Obama to "bomb Iran,"](#) which appeared shortly after Tony Blair, having outlined why he helped invade Iraq, remarked ominously, ["We face the same problem about Iran today."](#) The Chilcot Inquiry in the United Kingdom on how the Iraq War was launched ironically coincided with a considerable [military build-up](#) in the Persian Gulf region. All this occurred amidst the continued struggle of Iran's civil rights movement and proclamations of Western leaders to be in support of the latter's efforts. But is there any evidence for this?

In contradistinction to war, sanctions are widely portrayed as necessary, almost healthy medicine to bring about change in the opponent's policies. However, as the history of the West-Iran conflict proves, sanctions have rather the state of crisis alive than contributed to its resolution. Nonetheless, Western governments do not seem to have lost their dubious fascination for them.

As the call for "crippling sanctions" became morally questionable when last summer the impressive Green wave shook the streets of Tehran for fear of wrecking the same, today the benign sounding "smart" or "targeted" sanctions are on the tip of everyone's tongue. Yet, a close look reveals a great deal of wishful thinking as to the effects of such sanctions.

Gigantic dimensions of "smart sanctions"

"Smart sanctions", it is claimed, are a magic wand with which to decapitate evil. In the Iranian case, evil is being identified with the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps. Originally a defense organization erected to counter Iraqi aggression in the 1980s, the Guardians have developed into an expansive socio-politico-economic conglomerate which is believed to possess unrivalled economic and political power in today's Islamic Republic.

As we are told, "smart sanctions" shall target the Guardians' grip on the Iranian power structure. The much neglected difficulty here - though it is widely acknowledged that the bulk of Iranian economy is now in the hands of the Guardians - is that in the end millions of civilians connected to [these wide-ranging sectors](#) thought to be controlled by the Guardians will be affected. Seen in this light, the gigantic dimension of these alleged "smart sanctions" comes to the fore.

Moreover, so-called ["crippling sanctions"](#) that target petrol supply to Iran are still [en route](#). In anticipation of those U.S. unilateral sanctions, the world's largest insurance companies have announced their [retreat from Iran](#). This concerns both the financial and shipping

sectors, and affects petrol supplies to Iran which imports 40 percent of its needs. Also three [giant oil traders ended supplies](#) to Iran, which amounted to [half of Tehran's imports](#). Needless to say, such sanctions ultimately harm the population. To add, a complete implementation thereof – i.e. preventing Asian competitors to step in – would require a naval blockade which amounts to an act of war.

Crippling the ordinary population

As stressed by civil society figures and [economists](#), the price of sanctions is being [paid by the Iranian population at large](#). The Iranian economy – manufacturing, agriculture, bank and financial sectors etc. – [has been hurt from almost three decades of sanctions](#). Even today, businesses cannot easily obtain much needed goods on the international market to continue production and must often pay above-standard prices. Moreover, the [scientific community](#) has faced discrimination in areas of research as has Iran's technological advances been slowed down.

Reflecting the dangers sanctions pose to the Green Movement, last fall [Mir-Hossein Mousavi stated](#): “We are opposed to any types of sanctions against our nation.” The same was recently uttered by his fellow opposition leader Mehdi Karroubi in [an interview](#) with Corriere della Serra.

Meanwhile a more fundamental problem remains – hardly acknowledged by many proponents who succumb to the adventurous illusion of having a say in the design and implementation of sanctions: They are mainly [designed by](#) the [American Israeli Public Affairs Committee](#) (AIPAC), introduced to the U.S. Congress and finally implemented by the Treasury Department's Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence [Stuart Levey](#) – [an AIPAC confidant](#). Along this process, the potential suffering by Iran's civil society hardly plays a role.

Sanctions – either “crippling” or “smart” – ultimately [harm ordinary citizens](#). “Smart sanctions” is as much of an oxymoron as “smart weapons” which supposedly by “surgical strikes” only take out evil components. Indeed, much as in the case of their militaristic brothers-in-spirit, in the end the “collateral damages” of “smart sanctions” remain dominant.

A futile political instrument in today's world

More generally, in an increasingly multipolar globalized world, sanctions imposed upon energy-rich countries are basically futile as an effective policy tool. Too numerous are business-driven actors that are only too happy to jump in. Thus, Chinese, Russian, and even U.S. companies (acting via Dubai) have hugely benefitted from the European, U.S.-pressured withdrawal from the Iranian market.

Thus, sanctions – a medicine with which Western policy-circles are so obsessed with – are not a cure but a slow poison applied to the civil society and thus the civil rights movement. Sanctions as prototype of economic warfare in concert with the seasonal flaring-up of war-mongering are a dangerous mix. The deafening “drums of war” continue to bang upon the beating heart of Iran's civil society.

Sanctions and threats of war: Poisonous for democratic development

All this suggests that sanctions are perhaps a fig leaf for other agendas. For, in contrast to

Western proclamations, sanctions do harm the civil society while cementing the position of hardliners. Iran's middle class as a result will be affected by this further isolation of the country as sanctions punish honest traders and reward corrupt ones. The Guardians with their assumed 60 harbors at the Persian Gulf control the bulk of imports and sanctions will only bolster the trend of flourishing "black channels".

One might indeed argue that the not-so-unconscious "collateral damage" of never-ending sanctions is any meaningful transition to more democracy in Iran – a prospect which would set an uncomfortable precedent for the West's authoritarian friends in the region.

What next: "Surgical strikes" or serious diplomacy?

At the very least, the unending story of sanctions bears testimony to Western leaders' commitment to uphold "credibility" in the face of adverse conditions as much as to imposing their will on Iran. A futile exercise – even a dangerous one – if one begins to contemplate the aftermath of "smart sanctions" being imposed: Will the next desperate move entail "surgical strikes"?

Instead of going on believing that sanctions will one day develop their desired effects, it is high time to put the brakes. Hence, the only way forward would be to adopt a set of policies that would disarm hardliners of all sides whose business flourishes in the vicious cycle of enmity. It is only by détente that grist to the mills of radicalism can be removed – and a sustainable de-militarization of Iranian politics attained. Revoking existing sanctions on goods for civilian use could work wonders that would shake the very fundamentals of confrontational postures.

Despite all frivolous claims, the diplomatic route has not been exhausted. Indeed, we are far from it. Since the core problem remains the "security dilemma" in the region, it would be wise for the West to call upon Israel to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The transatlantic "coercive strategy" vis-à-vis Iran – as it is accurately [described in Diplomatic Studies](#) – must be suspended for it undermines prospects for peace and development towards democracy.

***Ali Fathollah-Nejad** is a German-Iranian political scientist; Ph.D. researcher in International Relations at the universities of Münster (Germany) and London (School of Oriental and African Studies); currently a Visiting Lecturer in globalization and development at the University of Westminster, London; author of [The Iran Conflict and the Obama Administration: Old Wine in New Skins?](#) (in German, Potsdam University Press, 2010); web site: fathollah-nejad.com.*

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Ali Fathollah-Nejad](#), Global Research, 2010

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **Ali Fathollah-Nejad**

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca