



MEI MEDIA WATCH

(A Survey of Editorials)

No. 03

Friday, 2 July 2010

UNSC Sanctions against Iran, June 2010

Compiled by

Lipika Kamra

[**Note:** On 9 June 2010, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1929 imposing fourth round of sanctions against Iran over its suspected nuclear programme.¹ The Resolution was supported by 12 members; while Brazil and Turkey voted against, Lebanon abstained. **Editor, MEI Media Watch.**]

*

Khaleej Times
ONLINE

Dubai, Editorial, 9 June 2010, Tuesday

1. Iran sanctions won't work

EU curbs against Iran a bad idea

The drama over Iran's nuclear programme has taken another interesting turn. Russia has slammed the United States and European Union for bringing in fresh, unilateral sanctions against Iran.

¹ The text of the resolution is available at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2010/sc9948.doc.htm>

President Dmitry Medvedev whose country had, under intense pressure from the United States, voted for the punitive international sanctions against Iran earlier this month at the United Nations is upset that the new US-EU sanctions go beyond what had been sanctioned by the world body and target investments in Iran's crucial oil industry and trade with the Islamic republic.

Since Russia has long been a trading partner of the Islamic republic, not to mention its considerable military and defence cooperation with Teheran, Moscow has enough reasons to get exercised over these new sanctions. So does China which has invested billions of dollars in Iran's aging oil industry over the past few years and is the largest importer of Iranian oil.

Russia and China, the two permanent members of the UN Security Council, had decided to go with the US sponsored sanctions against Teheran in the face of vociferous Iranian protests because they had been assured that the sanctions would persuade Iran to "cooperate" with the IAEA and not hurt Iran's oil industry or its economic and commercial interests.

The new US-EU sanctions, okayed in Brussels on Thursday close on the heels of UN sanctions passed on June 10, dramatically change all that. The new punitive measures not just threaten Iran's vital oil industry and financial sector but also undermine Russian and Chinese economic interests in Iran and the Middle East. This is why the EU move is unfortunate, unnecessary and disturbing.

Since this campaign against Iran was kicked off under President George W Bush, egged on by the Israelis and the neocons at home, the Middle East – and the world – has looked to Europe for leadership, reason and balancing the hawkish US policies.

This is why it is unfortunate that the EU should jump on the 'Hit Iran' bandwagon with the US. It is even more unfortunate that this should be happening under President Barack Obama, who has passionately championed a "new way forward" with the Muslim world. As we have argued before, the language of force and sanctions is not just unreasonable against Iran, it is almost always counterproductive. Sanctions only end up fortifying the regime, just as they did in Iraq yesterday and just as they do in Iran today.

Lest we forget Iran has had a series of sanctions against its name in one form or other for years, in fact for decades. They don't seem to have ruffled the ayatollahs in any manner possible. More important, it is ordinary people, not the regime, who always pay the price for such curbs. Again Iraq is a very good example of the futility of this approach. Only dialogue and diplomatic engagement can bring Iran on board. The Turkey-Brazil proposal of processing Iran's nuclear fuel abroad remains the best bet to resolve this crisis. Especially considering Obama himself had offered a similar deal to Iran during the EU-Iran talks in Geneva last year.

Source:

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticleNew.asp?xfile=data/editorial/2010/June/editorial_June16.xml§ion=editorial&col=

International Herald Tribune

New York, Editorial, 10 June 2010, Wednesday

2. Round 4

They were too long in coming and do not go far enough, but the United Nations Security Council finally imposed a new round, the fourth, of sanctions on Iran.

The penalties take aim at military, trade and financial transactions by the Revolutionary Guards Corps, which runs the country's illicit nuclear program. You can be certain that Iran is already looking for ways around them. It has been reflagging and renaming state-owned cargo ships so they can evade an existing ban on arms sales. It is not going to let up.

We are encouraged by reports that the European Union is close to adopting rules on trade with Iran that would ensure that all members follow [the United Nations resolution](#). We are less sure about the intentions of Russia and China. They voted for the sanctions—a fact that is sure to resonate in Tehran. Russia's summit with Iran and Turkey this week blunted the message.

The day's most disturbing development was the two no votes in the Security Council from Turkey and Brazil. (Lebanon, at least, abstained.) Both are disappointed that their efforts to broker a nuclear deal with Iran didn't go far. Like pretty much everyone else, they were played by Tehran. It is hard to see why either would want to enable Iran's nuclear ambitions — or put themselves on the opposite side of all the world's major powers.

New sanctions were not inevitable. Not if Iran had heeded repeated Security Council demands to halt nuclear fuel production. Instead, it expanded and increased the level of uranium enrichment. The International Atomic Energy Agency's most recent report says Iran has produced enough fuel that, with further enrichment, could make two nuclear weapons. Iran is still thwarting the agency's inspectors. Last fall, it was caught hiding yet another major nuclear facility.

Since 2006, the major powers have repeatedly offered to negotiate. Iran never showed sincere interest. The big powers made a smart move on Wednesday by reaffirming a 2008 proposal, offering Iran diplomatic, security and economic incentives if it suspends nuclear fuel production. If Iran truly wants a diplomatic resolution, it should take them up on the offer.

We don't know what, if any, mixture of pressure and persuasion might change Tehran's mind. We are sure that one more round of incrementally tougher sanctions won't be enough. All the major powers are going to have to keep pressing.

Source:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/10/opinion/10thu2.html?scp=1&sq=Iran%20sanctions&st=Search>



Editorial, 10 June 2010, Thursday

3. Security Council passes another fear-based resolution

The UN Security Council has approved another fear-based resolution against Iran. On Wednesday, the fourth Iran sanctions resolution in four years was approved by a vote of 12-2.

Brazil and Turkey voted against the resolution and Lebanon abstained.

However, the United States and its allies on the Security Council should not be buoyant about the resolution because they failed to gain the consensus of all the non-permanent members.

The fact that Turkey and Brazil, two U.S. allies, voted against the resolution provides further proof that the actions against Iran and the latest decision of the Security Council are based on secret deals struck by the major powers.

Thus, those who say the U.S. abandoned its Eastern European missile shield plan in order to win the support of Russia were probably correct.

In addition, sanctions were lifted on five Russian companies, which was also probably part of the payoff.

And Washington's decision to sell heavy weaponry to Taiwan, which China regards as a renegade province that should be under its sovereignty, was most likely taken to put pressure on China to vote in favour of the anti-Iran resolution.

If the non-permanent members of the Security Council that voted in favour of the resolution were not influenced by the economic and political machinations of the Western powers, they might have voted against the resolution.

This shows that the resolution was totally unjustified and was interest-based and fear-based rather than a logical and evidence-based decision.

Source: http://www.tehrantimes.com/Index_view.asp?code=221028

guardian.co.uk

London, Editorial, 10 June 2010, Thursday

4. UN sanctions on Iran: A gift to the regime

Renewed sanctions give Mahmoud Ahmadinejad the opportunity of defying the world, and winning

In pushing ahead with a new round of UN Security Council sanctions, the US has rendered redundant an Iranian offer to send 1.2 tonnes of low-enriched uranium (LEU) to Turkey for reprocessing as reactor fuel. Western diplomats claimed they had not rejected the idea, but it was clear to all what the effect of the UN resolution would now be. This is a mistake President Barack Obama may yet come to regret. True, this time, the US has Russia and China at its side, but neither country is risking much by going with the flow while taking the credit for diminishing its strength. The same is not true for Mr Obama, who has invested so much of his time and energy attempting to re-establish the primacy of US diplomacy over force. He will be seen by many to be walking away from the table at the very moment something appears to be on it.

This is not to belittle the difficulties the deal brokered by Turkey and Brazil posed. They were real enough: the quantity of LEU Iran offered to export abroad only represents half of its total stockpile; Iran would continue enrichment up to 20% of fissile purity; and no date had been set for the removal van. But nor should one lose sight of the concessions Iran made in offering to trade: that the fuel would be delivered in one shipment; that reprocessing could take place outside Iran's borders; and that the fuel rods would have to be delivered in a set timeframe. These were Iran's objections to the deal when it was proposed in October last year, and ones which they dropped this time round. The fuel swap would not have ended doubts about Iran's nuclear programme, but it would have established a precedent. Instead, the International Atomic Energy Agency is no further forward securing Iran's growing stockpile of enriched uranium in conditions where it could be controlled. Indeed, the international effort to ensure that Iran's nuclear programme remains civilian has just taken a step backwards.

The sanctions have been devised to increase the cost paid by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the elite Revolutionary Guards in defying world opinion. But the architects of the financial curbs failed to address two inconvenient truths: the first is that the opposition movement of Mir Hossein Mousavi also regards uranium enrichment as a national right, and opposes another round of sanctions; and the second is that Mr Ahmadinejad himself will relish them. Renewed sanctions give him the opportunity of defying the world, and winning. Everyone is taking stock a year after the disputed election which convulsed the country. It gave rise to the biggest ever challenge to its authority the Islamic Republic has seen. But months of repression, torture, show trials, rapes in prison and hangings have had their intended effect: the Green movement has been decapitated and eviscerated. Its nominal leaders have called for a peaceful rally to mark the anniversary in the full knowledge of what even peaceful protest risks. Their sacrifice has not been in vain. As the Iranian saying goes, a fire is burning within the ashtray, but predicting where and when it will burst into flame again is a mug's game.

The two reformists Mr Mousavi and Mehdi Karroubi have sought to portray themselves as the true heirs of the Islamic revolution's spiritual leader, the late Ayatollah Khomeini, but this tactic has since worn thin and Khomeini's successor Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has stepped up his drive to paint Mousavi and Karroubi as western-run heretics. Not for nothing has Mr Mousavi called this the year of "patience and endurance". In retrospect, the western media overestimated the importance Twitter and Facebook played in fanning dissent. It depicted the political struggle solely as one between a politically active and educated tranche of the electorate and the regime, when it was also between a liberal and a conservative part of Iran, at least six million strong. If the fire of dissent is glowing, it does so now under a lot of cigarette ash.

Source: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jun/10/iran-nuclear-sanctions-mahmoud-ahmadinejad>



Editorial, 10 June 2010, Thursday

5. Iran nuclear sanctions not enough

The sanctions send a message, but are far from debilitating. The West needs to continue to engage diplomatically with Tehran.

The Obama administration says the new economic sanctions against Iran adopted by the U.N. Security Council on Wednesday are the toughest ever against that country's military and financial interests, and demonstrate a consensus among the major powers that Tehran must not develop a nuclear weapon. Though this may be accurate, it is also true that the sanctions are far from crippling and are unlikely to be much more effective than the previous three rounds in persuading Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment program.

The U.N. resolution, approved by a vote of 12 to 2 with Turkey and Brazil voting no and Lebanon abstaining, targets Iran's powerful Revolutionary Guard and bans the country from investing in uranium mining, pursuing ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons or purchasing from eight other broad categories of heavy weapons. It imposes sanctions such as an asset freeze on 40 Iranian companies, organizations and shipping lines, more than doubling the number already on the list. It also calls on all countries to cooperate in cargo inspections when presented with "reasonable grounds" to suspect material for the Iranian nuclear program.

But the resolution does not include an embargo on Iranian oil sales, which account for an estimated three-fourths of the country's revenues. Nor does it impede normal trade that might affect typical Iranians (or the economic interests of allies Russia and China). It calls on, rather than requires, countries to block financial transactions that could contribute to Iranian nuclear activities, and the resulting implementation is likely to be uneven at best.

Source: <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-ed-sanctions-20100610,0,5349934.story>



Beijing, Editorial, 10 June 2010, Thursday

6. Nuclear weapons off-limits to Iran

The UN Security Council voted Wednesday to pass new sanctions against Iran, sending the message that the international community is worried about the nuclear program the country is developing.

Iran has to pay attention.

Three previous sanctions have disrupted normal business and trade activities in Iran. The new sanctions, the toughest ones yet, according to the US, targeting roughly twice the number of entities in the previous resolution, will only aggravate the situation.

Both the West and Iran are raising the rhetoric over the consequences. With Russia oscillating between the two sides, China is left with the important task of bringing balance and keeping the issue under control.

China has stuck with its stance that it supports the Iranian government's efforts to peacefully utilize nuclear energy. Meanwhile, it is against any nuclear weapons proliferation.

China also opposes the issue being used as an excuse to topple the Iranian government.

The new sanctions were inevitable, but China worked to smooth the contents. China's vote for new sanctions does not signal it will give up diplomatic means of solving the issue. It will not take sides simply because of pressure. Trying to keep every country concerned at the negotiation table is what China is doing as a responsible political power.

Iran's attempt to get hold of a nuclear weapon is out of its deep insecurity. Its confrontation with the US has intensified. Internationally, Iran is also facing hostility. This includes a nuclear weapons-powered Israel, cultural isolation from much of the Islamic world and uncertain relations with its neighbouring countries.

Persuading Iran to give up nuclear weapons will be hard to achieve without the tension surrounding the issue eased first.

Iran cannot be cornered with the shadow of regime collapsing hanging over it all the time.

China's permission for new sanctions does not mean it would side with the US on tougher measures toward Iran.

We are worried that the latest sanction may close the door of negotiations between Iran and the West, leaving the possibility open that tensions will grow. We insist that diplomacy still be prioritized.

Another nuclear country in the region should be ruled out, and a war caused by a nuclear crisis would have far-reaching implications and must be avoided.

Iran should convince the world with more details that its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes.

The Iranian nuclear crisis is far from over, and demands new solutions from the world.

Source: <http://opinion.globaltimes.cn/editorial/2010-06/540460.html>



Jeddah, Editorial, 10 June 2010, Thursday

7. Misconceived

The fourth round of UN sanctions against Iran over its nuclear program is misconceived and will very probably turn out to be a serious error.

The Russians and the Chinese will come to regret their albeit reluctant backing of Washington's confrontational policy.

What they have done is sign up to the long-standing US hypocrisy which decries Iran's suspected push to acquire nuclear weapons while totally ignoring that Israel is already a nuclear power. The ironic difference is that while Iran is in breach of its commitments made when it signed the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Israel is not, for the simple reason that it has never signed the document. The existence of Israel's nuclear arsenal and Washington's determination to ignore it, completely undermines any drive to persuade the Iranians to eschew any atomic weapons program themselves. Yet the Obama administration cannot, or will not, recognize how fatally this damages its arguments against Iran.

And the Russians and Chinese have allowed themselves to be suckered into a flawed confrontation with the regime of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

What is worse is that the UN Security Council's imposition of a new round of sanctions cuts across the efforts of Brazil and Turkey to provide Teheran with an honourable way out of the impasse. By agreeing in principle to take spent nuclear fuel for reprocessing, these two countries could have produced a settlement that was acceptable to all parties. However, perhaps because the solution was not invented in Washington, the Americans chose to ignore it and press on with their new sanctions call.

Then there is the extreme likelihood that these latest sanctions will not work but, as with Iraq, will actually damage ordinary Iranians. Ahmadinejad and his people have long expected these latest restrictions and will have made provisions to circumvent them where necessary. They will divert whatever national resources they need away from ordinary people to their own purposes. However, more sinisterly, they will almost certainly use the heightened tension to beef up their security clampdown on opposition leaders and supporters. Dissenting voices within the country will seem ever more like treason and will be dealt with harshly. Among those who will be muzzled will be the counsellors of moderation who while supporting the regime, doubt the wisdom of its unfettered responses to Washington's continuing provocative behaviour.

Ahmadinejad is not noted for mincing his words and his riposte to the new sanctions was entirely predictable. Given the certainty that he would react with more anger and bombast, it is incredible that the Security Council, with the notable exceptions of Brazil and Turkey succumbed to American pressure. The Russians or Chinese might have been expected to insist that the price of their support would be the simultaneous tabling of the issue of Israel's nuclear weapons stockpile. Unfortunately, the Israelis may now see the silence of Moscow and Beijing as a green light to launch a military strike on Iranian nuclear facilities, the consequences of which are too terrible to imagine. A golden opportunity to rid the Middle East of nuclear weapons has been thrown away. Apparently, what Washington has in mind when it talks of a nuclear-free Middle East is a Middle East in which there is only one nuclear power.

Source: <http://arabnews.com/opinion/editorial/article63874.ece>

gulfnews.com

Dubai, Editorial, 10 June 2010, Thursday

8. Careful approach to Iran is essential

Tehran needs to be more transparent, but that won't happen if it is politically isolated

The manner in which relations with Iran are to be tackled is critical given that this will either heighten tensions in the region or bring things to a peaceful conclusion as far as the country's controversial nuclear programme is concerned. Iran and the countries that oppose its nuclear programme have a responsibility to make a peaceful resolution possible.

The UN Security Council has passed a tough fourth round of sanctions against Iran. All resolutions adopted since 2006 have called on Iran to be transparent about its programme as well as imposing a ban on all items related to the enrichment of uranium. In reaction to the recent proposal, Iran had threatened that it could break off all talks over its nuclear programme. Yet the US, Britain and France believe that sanctions will bring about psychological pressure, consequently forcing Iran to disclose the details of its nuclear programme.

It is not clear whether the sanctions approach will achieve results or backfire. Hence, this option should be carefully examined. But it is also necessary for Iran to be transparent in its transactions.

Source: <http://gulfnews.com/opinions/editorials/careful-approach-to-iran-is-essential-1638985>



Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

9. Too little, very late

Parody of sanctions makes laughing stock of world.

The full half of the glass is that the international community has finally united to impose further sanctions on Iran. The empty half is that the package approved by the UN Security Council does not remotely constitute the crippling sanctions which might just have exerted a sobering effect on Teheran as it proceeds toward a nuclear weapons capability.

The sanctions voted through on Wednesday lack the bite of the package that was initially proposed. They were watered down, over protracted negotiations, to enlist the support of reluctant powers like Russia and China, with the goal of thereby creating the semblance of an international consensus. But what Moscow and Beijing proved willing to swallow is so diluted a package that Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad must be chuckling to himself, despite his outward show of sound and fury.

Primarily lacking from the sanctions concoction is anything that will impact Iran's energy industry, when what was most critically needed was a ban on the export to Iran of refined petroleum products. Although Iran is one of the world's prime sources of crude oil, it has never developed the adequate capacity to process its abundant black gold. Hence Iran is heavily dependent on foreign supplies. The prohibition of such supplies could dramatically weaken the ayatollahs' regime, since it would directly impact the citizenry and would likely trigger a popular backlash. Three years ago, gas stations throughout Iran were set alight by angry protesters rioting against price hikes at the pump.

Sanctions-generated fuel shortages would have meant deactivated vehicles, electricity blackouts, industrial and commercial paralysis. That would have sent a potent message that the world means business when it comes to thwarting Teheran's nuclear ambitions.

A parody of sanctions, by contrast, makes a laughingstock of the international community. The best hope now is that the US and EU will quickly impose tougher sanctions of their own.

EVEN THE deficient sanctions that were approved at the UN aren't likely to be stringently enforced.

If we ignore the predilection of some private concerns in the free world to keep trading with Iran regardless of its incitement and its aggression, we may assume that most of the West – i.e. the US and EU – will adhere to the new strictures and that whatever violations come to the fore will be dealt with.

Elsewhere, however, reluctant sanctions-backers like Russia and China are less likely to religiously abide by them. The situation in the radical segments of South America, where Ahmadinejad enjoys an incongruous following, is worse still, as it is throughout much of Asia, particularly the Muslim components. Worst of all are Iran's allies in this region, beginning with Syria and its Lebanese puppet and reaching all the way to transformed Turkey (which voted against Wednesday's package, along with Brazil, while Lebanon abstained).

Breaking and evading these sanctions ought to be a breeze for Ahmadinejad. A full year after Iran's deceptive elections, which spurred countrywide demonstrations, he may be less popular but his position is stable. After the regime brutally quashed his opposition, it is very doubtful that stunted sanctions will destabilize his hold on power.

None of that will moderate his vehement anti-sanctions rhetoric. Ahmadinejad is putting on an extravagant spectacle of anger and outrage. Domestically, he derives much psychological benefit from appearing like the beleaguered patriotic warrior, facing off against the Zionist-lackey West.

Today's resourceful and emboldened Iran is a very different entity from the pariah state

It was just a year ago, when credible sanctions would have been far more effective. Teheran has shielded its crucial interests from financial restrictions and its newly bolstered alliances may be valuable in deflecting pressure. The international community missed its best opportunity to apply economic pressure during 2009's post-election unrest. In the interim, Iran has contracted game-changing deals and made strides toward self-sufficiency.

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton may speak of Wednesday's package representing "the most significant sanctions that Iran has ever faced." But Russia's Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has been warning against "excessive" measures lest they cause "hardship" in Iran. The subtext is that Russian and Chinese commerce with Iran will proceed all but unhindered.

Wednesday's sanctions, then, are not the antidote to the Iranian nuclear threat that Israel had hoped for and that the free world so badly needs.

In some ways, they may even exacerbate Israel's predicament. They will lend the appearance of an international mobilization to curb Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions, but in actuality will achieve nothing – the worst of all worlds.

Source: <http://www.jpost.com/Home/Article.aspx?id=178019>

THE DAILY STAR

LEBANON

Beirut, Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

10. The nagging 'what ifs' on Iran

What if ... the threat isn't what it seems to be? The threat, of course, is the bogeyman of Iran's nuclear program, and to be honest, the jury is still out on what this program actually entails.

The United Nations Security Council has had it say, endorsing yet another round of sanctions on the Islamic Republic this week. The scope of the sanctions and their effectiveness certainly deserve attention, but we must remember that the international community doesn't have a spotless record when it comes to confronting international "trouble-makers." Whether the matter involves the Suez War of 1956, when Egypt was seen as a threat to regional stability, or George W Bush's more recent crusade against Iraq, with its supposedly WMD-armed mad dictator threatening the world, just because a few leading countries make accusations, it doesn't mean the accusations hold any water.

In the case of Iran, the jury is still out on what the Islamic Republic wants to achieve with its nuclear program. It's a complicated story, with many contending versions being put forward, and the Israelis capitalizing on the situation, to feed the world's fear of nuclear weapons in the hands of "extremists."

What if ... the evidence has been concocted, and Iran wants a peaceful nuclear program?

Nonetheless, Iran has been overplaying its hand, and a false sense of pride could lead to dire repercussions. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's pronouncements receive the most intense scrutiny, but the analogies with Iraq aren't very exact. Ahmadinejad isn't a Saddam-style "leader for life," and there are other officials who obviously influence events in the Islamic Republic.

Be that as it may, Iran has had opportunities to arrive at a settlement, and Ahmadinejad and others have squandered them. Iran's exalted sense of national pride seems to have dominated its dealings with the international community. It seemed to think the geopolitical situation was a

huge bazaar, in which Iran could hold its own, and hold everyone at bay, by continuing to haggle.

For now, there are rumblings from Russia, to the effect that a shipment of surface-to-air missiles to the Islamic Republic might be cancelled. In any case, Russia's vote on Wednesday showed the Iranians that there are limits to haggling, and that relations with Washington are more important than relations with Tehran.

Again, it could be all based on a false premise: that Iran is hell-bent on acquiring nuclear weapons, which begs the question of how they could be deployed, or actually used.

But this is beside the point: Iran has overplayed its hand, and the Israelis must be happy with the result. The only questions now are how the Iranians might react to the latest sanctions, and how the international community might respond in turn. These questions are of course joined by the original, nagging question: what if?

Source:

http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition_id=10&categ_id=17&article_id=115824#axzz0qYFYQVxR

THE HINDU

Chennai, Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

11. A needless provocation

Driven by myopia and sheer bloody-mindedness, the United States and 11 other members of the United Nations Security Council have voted to tighten sanctions on Iran. Brazil and Turkey, which recently brokered an important fuel swap agreement with Tehran, voted against the sanctions resolution while Lebanon abstained. What matters is not the specific provisions contained in the latest round of sanctions but the fact that Washington insisted on pushing them through just when a small window for confidence-building and trust between Iran and the international community had been opened by the Turkish-Brazilian initiative. Under their proposal, which the International Atomic Energy Agency is now considering, Iran will promptly transfer 1,200 kg of low enriched uranium — roughly half the amount the IAEA estimates it has produced to date — to Turkey, where it would be held in escrow. Russia and France would then fabricate an equivalent amount of enriched uranium fuel rods suitable for use in the Tehran Research Reactor. Once these rods are ready, they will be exchanged for the Iranian LEU.

Although the swap addresses an issue distinct from the one Iran is currently being sanctioned for, the successful implementation of the agreement would have been a major confidence-building measure. The U.S. and its allies would have succeeded in removing from the territory of Iran half its LEU stockpile — an amount that could theoretically be used to fabricate one nuclear device should Iran leave the Non-Proliferation Treaty and start weapons-grade enrichment. From the Iranian point of view, it would have demonstrated that the international community was capable of reasonableness and flexibility. From there, the Turks and Brazilians, perhaps supplemented by

other powers, might have been able to move their engagement with Iran to a higher level, securing answers to the few remaining questions the IAEA has about the Iranian nuclear programme. But Wednesday's sanctions resolution changes everything. They send a signal to the diverse stakeholders in Tehran that reasonableness doesn't pay. Iran is likely to harden its attitude, thereby allowing the U.S. and its allies to take one more step down the path of confrontation. India, which has a major economic and strategic stake in the preservation of peace in the Persian Gulf and West Asia, should stop being a passive bystander to the crisis that is now looming large. By insisting on sanctions at this stage, the P-5 have only succeeded in scoring own goals. India may not be a member of the U.N. Security Council but that should not preclude it from actively pursuing a diplomatic end to the standoff.

Source: <http://beta.thehindu.com/opinion/editorial/article452264.ece>



Lahore, Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

12. Sanctions on Iran

Tough sanctions slapped on Iran by the UN Security Council have raised many questions about the Obama administration's policy posture, which does not seem to be any different from that of the Bush administration, at least on this issue. The new sanctions will severely damage Iran's economic interests and prospective business transactions. Out of the 15 members, 12 — including the five permanent members — voted in favour, Turkey and Brazil voted against the sanctions, while Lebanon abstained from voting. Preceding the vote, Turkey and Brazil made intensive efforts for a diplomatic solution to the problem and were able to convince Iran to agree to all the conditions proposed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and endorsed by the White House. The most significant condition was the demand to transfer a bulk of Iran's low enriched uranium (LEU) to another country. The three countries signed an agreement on May 17 to this effect. Understandably, Turkey and Brazil as well as the IAEA have expressed extreme disappointment over the White House's rejection of the agreement and going ahead with the sanctions. Surprisingly, China and Russia, which had so far adopted a more accommodative approach in dealing with Iran, decided to side with the US regarding these sanctions, pointing towards a consensus amongst great powers vis-à-vis Iran's nuclear programme.

The IAEA has played a positive role in trying to defuse the West's threat perceptions by taking a more rational position based on ground realities. Dr Mohamed El-Baradei has explicitly stated that after removing half of Iran's nuclear material to Turkey as a confidence building measure and the rest under IAEA guards and seals, there was no imminent threat of Iran preparing a nuclear bomb. The US rejection of the IAEA advice is not something new. Even when the IAEA

inspectors had found “no smoking gun” in Iraq during their search for the weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), the US went ahead and invaded Iraq. Later, it was proved that there were indeed no WMDs in Iraq. It seems that history is being repeated, only with more players involved now.

There are important questions to ask here. Are these sanctions being imposed to please Israel because of its perceived threat of Hezbollah and Hamas, seen to be supported by Iran? Iran still espouses Khomeini’s anti-US stance, but does that warrant crippling a country’s economy, which may not impact the ruling elite, but will definitely affect the common people. Did the US exhaust all diplomatic channels to convince Iran? Have the sanctions have been put on merit or are they just a ploy of political victimisation? Ironically, nobody questions Israel’s accumulation of nuclear stockpiles. The state has time and again demonstrated an aggressive intent towards its neighbours, while Iran is being hunted and hounded. Last but not the least, why is there a deadly silence in Pakistan over this issue? India abandoned Iran because of the civil-nuclear deal with the US. Pakistan is under no such obligation to keep quiet on the political victimisation of a friendly country.

Nuclear proliferation is indeed a source of concern. However, various manifestations of US aggression in different parts of the world, particularly Iraq, since the fall of the Soviet Union, has convinced smaller nations that conventional military capability is no guarantee to security. It was hoped that the Obama administration would approach the Iran issue differently than his predecessor and send out a message of reconciliation, rather than confrontation, to the world. The UN Security Council Resolution has belied all those hopes.

Source: http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2010\06\11\story_11-6-2010_pg3_1



Beijing, Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

13. Workable diplomacy

Fresh sanctions adopted by the United Nations Security Council against Iran on Wednesday should actually be viewed as another chance for further diplomatic effort to break the nuclear impasse through peaceful solutions acceptable to all parties.

Compared to the previous UN resolutions imposed since 2006, the new one is broader and more intense and has created new categories of sanctions against the Islamic nation.

It prohibits Iran from investing in nuclear enrichment operations abroad and imposes binding restrictions on the country's conventional arms imports.

The current UN resolution reflects the concerns of the international community over Iran's purpose in developing its nuclear program. It aims to push Teheran to undertake active measures that will fulfil its obligations regarding non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

However, sanctions can never fundamentally solve the international standoff over the nuclear issue. The sanctions do not necessarily mean diplomatic effort will be a closed door. It should, instead, activate another round of diplomatic dialogue to bring Teheran back to the negotiating table.

China is always committed to a dual track approach in resolving the Iranian nuclear issue. While insisting that any UN resolution should contribute to the international non-proliferation regime, it has repeatedly stressed that the action be conducive to peace and stability in the Middle East and that it guarantees Iran's right for peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Iranian citizens should not bear the brunt of the sanctions and normal business exchanges with other nations should not get affected either.

All these principles have guided China's participation in the consultations on imposing sanctions against Iran. China hopes Iran would take concrete steps to convince the international community about the peaceful nature of its nuclear program.

In this regard, it is worth mentioning that the issue of Israel's nuclear capabilities was brought up for the first time in 19 years at a meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency Board of Governors, which began in Vienna on Monday.

The highlighting of this issue could be yet another important step in the region's de-nuclearization process.

Source: http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2010-06/11/content_9963974.htm



Karachi, Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

14. More sanctions

The fourth round of sanctions imposed by the UN Security Council on Iran on Wednesday is bound to trigger a new Tehran-centred nuclear crisis. UNSC resolution 1929 slaps new punitive measures on Tehran that include financial curbs, an expanded arms embargo and permission to seize cargo related to Iranian activities. American Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has described the sanctions as the “most significant that Iran has ever faced” but Iranian

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has rejected them as “a handkerchief which should be thrown in the dustbin.”

Given Iran’s hard-line stance it is unlikely that the new sanctions will achieve their goal of making Tehran suspend uranium enrichment. What is worse is that the polarisation in the world community is bound to intensify, with many countries viewing Iran as a means to address their energy concerns. Iran has survived three rounds of sanctions since 2006 without moderating its stance. With the crucial energy sector having been omitted under resistance from Russia and China in the watered-down new sanctions regime there is no reason why Tehran, as per Mr Ahmadinejad’s prediction, will not survive this time too.

The only way of pre-empting Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons — that is if that intention indeed exists — is to engage with Tehran on the issue of uranium enrichment. Turkey and Brazil were therefore right in seeking to pave the way to a negotiated settlement by entering into a nuclear fuel swap that would require Tehran to ship the bulk of its low-enriched uranium to Turkey for safekeeping until an equivalent mass of nuclear fuel was delivered to Tehran. This deal was originally proposed by the Obama administration in October 2009. Brazilian President Lula acted as the intermediary to get Iran to agree — only to have the US regress on its offer.

This is a dangerous game especially at a time when the International Atomic Energy Agency has yet to certify that Iran is indeed manufacturing nuclear weapons. President Obama will lose the goodwill of many. Lebanon abstained on the sanctions resolution and many in the Muslim world will support Iran. The American move is being seen as having come as a result of pressure from the Israel lobby and the big arms manufacturers who want to see Iran defanged. But caught in a dilemma — China and Russia do not see eye to eye with America — President Obama needs to do some clear thinking on Iran. Meanwhile, Iran would do well to assuage the fears of many countries regarding its nuclear ambitions by being more transparent about its atomic programme.

Source: <http://www.dawn.com/wps/wcm/connect/dawn-content-library/dawn/the-newspaper/editorial/21-more-sanctions-160-sk-01>

The Miami Herald

Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

15. Sanctions against Iran fall short: Dissent by Turkey, Brazil weakens resolution

The United States managed to win Security Council approval for new sanctions against Iran this week, but don’t bet that this will slow down Iran’s drive to acquire nuclear capability.

The Security Council vote may be a diplomatic victory for the Obama administration, but it falls short as an effective mechanism to deter Iran from its quest for nukes. The administration

laboured mightily to build a coalition for a resolution that would make it harder for Iran to obtain nuclear technology and finance commercial operations -- without drawing a veto from Russia and China, Iran's trade and investment partners.

The new sanctions restrict the ability of Iran's banks to finance international deals. They add Iranian companies to the names on the commercial embargo. Nations are authorized to inspect cargo ships bound for Iran suspected of carrying nuclear material.

Watered-down resolution

But winning Russian and Chinese support came at the cost of the "crippling" sanctions Mr. Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton originally sought. The result is a watered-down resolution with limited effect. Neither a Russian-assisted nuclear plant in Iran nor Chinese investment in Iranian oil fields will be affected by the sanctions. The Iranian economy will not be seriously harmed.

It's unlikely that the Security Council resolution -- the fourth and stiffest set of sanctions imposed against Iran for its reckless behaviour -- will bring the regime of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to the negotiating table. The Iranian leader dismissed the new sanctions as "annoying flies, like a used tissue." His U.N. envoy, Mohammad Khazaei, vowed that Iran would not be deterred.

Just as troubling as the softening of the resolution was the inability of the Security Council to show unanimity in the face of Iran's continued defiance of the international community. No country voted against the three previous sanctions, but the vote in the Security Council on Tuesday was 12-2, with Brazil and Turkey voting No and Lebanon abstaining.

This is likely to be taken by Iran as a sign of weakening resolve by others and a measure of its own political muscle. Just a year ago, Ahmadinejad's regime drew international condemnation for the brutal suppression of peaceful protests against its fraudulent elections. Now those deadly actions seem to have been forgotten.

Dissenting voices

It is unclear exactly what Turkey and Brazil hope to accomplish by giving aid and comfort to Mr. Ahmadinejad and his cohorts in Tehran. There is room enough in the Western coalition for dissenting voices, but if the point is to show independence from the United States and its European allies on foreign policy, the Iranian issue is the wrong place to do it.

If this misguided support strengthens Iran's resolve to become a nuclear power, it increases the likelihood of an eventual showdown with Western powers that profits no one. As a result, the failure of Turkey and Brazil to stand shoulder to shoulder with the international community on this important vote makes the world a more dangerous place.

Source: <http://www.miamiherald.com/2010/06/11/1674375/sanctions-against-iran-fall-short.html>

TheNational

Abu Dhabi, Editorial, 11 June 2010, Friday

16. Sanctions on Iran arrive at a poignant time

The resolution passed by the United Nations on Wednesday authorising sanctions against Iran has been greeted with sighs of relief in western capitals, a mix of anger and defiance in Tehran, and questions about their effectiveness everywhere else.

Despite the overwhelming support for the resolution in the UN Security Council, including from Russia and China, some sobriety is in order. It is doubtful that this resolution alone will stop Iran's nuclear advance. Expectations for what the sanctions can accomplish should be set far lower than they are. At best, the resolution can slow Iran's nuclear efforts by hindering its ability to access sensitive technology while a diplomatic effort to test Iran's intentions is launched yet again.

This, at least, is the professed objective of the Obama administration. A change of heart in Tehran is unlikely, but perhaps the rising cost of doing business and the pain of isolation can accomplish more than Barack Obama's outstretched hand.

The timing of the resolution is poignant. Tomorrow Iran will commemorate the one-year anniversary of the controversial re-election of its president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, and the rise of the Green Movement. The passage of sanctions so close to this anniversary is not merely symbolic. Any effort to counter Iran's nuclear ambitions must also consider the country's complicated domestic politics.

The last thing the Iranian opposition wants is a nuclear accommodation that vindicates and strengthens Mr Ahmadinejad's base, though they do not wish for the Iranian people to endure more hardship. Until the Green Movement can revive the momentum of last year's demonstrations and present real alternatives, reformists will remain on the sidelines. They may even occasionally attack Mr Ahmadinejad from the right to scuttle any nuclear bargain.

Mr Ahmadinejad and his allies say they desire a deal, but they are unwilling to compromise on substance. That much was clear from their rejection of the Geneva deal last year and their touting of a pact brokered by Turkey and Brazil that was too little, too late.

At a time when Mr Ahmadinejad's domestic legitimacy has reached an all-time low – he was even booed at a public meeting last month – and his country is hit with more sanctions, Mr Ahmadinejad finds solace in his regional appeal and indulgence from emerging powers like Turkey and Brazil. His rants against Israel and the US merely hide his shortcomings to his

allies abroad. And yet, the sanctions may have a paradoxical effect of strengthening Mr Ahmadinejad and his allies in the Revolutionary Guards.

The international community is torn between the urgency of stopping Iran, which would require a bargain with its current leadership, and the moral imperative of supporting a more moderate, though beleaguered, opposition. This week's sanctions do little to clarify how these two aims will be reconciled; what matters far more is what happens inside Iran. But few things in the world are so opaque.

Source:

<http://www.thenational.ae/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20100611/OPINION/706109918/1033/editorials?template=opinion>



Vallejo, California, Editorial, 15 June 2010, Tuesday

17. Iran: Make the sanctions tougher

After five months of intense and difficult negotiations, the 15-member U.N. Security Council finally voted 12-2 with one abstention to impose a fourth round of sanctions against Iran. The intention of the penalties is to pressure Tehran into serious discussions about its nuclear arms ambitions.

Iran has consistently said it is enriching uranium for peaceful uses only. But much of the world, including the United States, has grave doubts about Iran's intentions and urge Tehran to meet its obligations under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

Iran has been intransigent in its refusal to cooperate with the United Nations about having any real transparency regarding its uranium enrichment program.

This unacceptable position has only intensified fears about the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran under the leadership of its fulminating President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

Unfortunately, the fourth round of sanctions have been watered down considerably to win the support of China and Russia, both of which do considerable business with Iran.

The penalties are being touted by the Obama administration as the toughest yet. That may be true, but they fall far short of anything that would bring real hardship to the ruling regime in Iran.

The sanctions ban Iran from investing in uranium mining, pursuing ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons or buying other heavy weapons. The penalties include an asset freeze on 40 Iranian companies, doubling the number already listed.

Also, the U.N. resolution weakly calls upon all nations to cooperate in cargo inspections if they have grounds to suspect they include material for Iran's nuclear program.

The Obama administration is calling the U.N. resolution a victory because of Russia's and China's cooperation. But the price of getting the support of all five of the U.N. Security Council members with veto power renders the sanctions almost meaningless. No one expects them to alter Tehran's nuclear policies anytime soon, if at all.

Last October, the Obama administration promoted diplomatic negotiations with Iran on a nuclear fuel swap agreement. A U.N. plan called for Iran to send more than half of its low-enriched uranium abroad for processing into fuel rods to be returned to Iran for use in a research reactor.

Iran balked at the plan last fall but eventually agreed in May to a similar deal with Turkey and Brazil. But the Obama administration opposed it, saying it was too little too late and that Iran would still have enough nuclear fuel to make a bomb.

Perhaps, but Tehran would have had a lot less nuclear fuel than without the deal. Instead of agreeing to at least the possibility of some substantial progress, the United States pressed ahead for sanctions that are unlikely to motivate Tehran to make any concessions or agree to any nuclear fuel swaps. That and a loss of face are why Greece and Turkey voted against the latest round of sanctions.

President Barack Obama said he is still open to diplomacy with Iran. However, the ineffective sanctions have already killed a limited negotiated nuclear fuel deal and are likely to delay any new ones. How that can be considered a "victory?"

Source: http://www.timesheraldonline.com/editorial/ci_15299509

THE JORDAN TIMES

Amman, Editorial, 16 June 2010, Wednesday

18. Resolution, not solution

It is ironic that the recent UN Security Council resolution slapping a series of sanctions on Iran because of its nuclear programme pitted Turkey and Brazil, two countries traditionally aligned with America, against the US, which sponsored the resolution, while Russia and China, normally not on Washington's side, voted for it.

There must have been quite a bit of behind-the-scenes negotiations and horse trading to pull off this Western victory. The fact that the resolution is anything but crippling as far as Tehran is concerned, might explain, in part at least, why there was a consensus in the council in its favour.

True, the sanctions applied on Iran include an arms embargo, travel restrictions on high-ranking Iranian officials, naval inspections of ships bound to or sailing from Iran, and a string of financial controls, but Moscow and Beijing still found them lenient and conciliatory enough to go along with them.

Ankara might have felt uncomfortable with the passing of the resolution, as it, in cooperation with Brazil, brokered the deal with Iran that entails a trade off between the two parties: shipments of huge amounts of uranium from Iran in return for some enriched amounts of uranium. But that could have been expected.

What counts most, now, is the instant rejection of the resolution by Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad who ridiculed it as being worthless.

It could be, after all, that the much celebrated resolution will turn out to be a shallow victory unable to advance the quest to solve Iran's controversial nuclear file.

If anything, the Security Council's decision only intensified tensions between Washington and its allies, on the one hand, and Iran and its supporters, on the other.

Source: <http://www.jordantimes.com/index.php?news=27494>



Editorial, 18 June 2010, Friday

19. After the Security Council Vote

There has been a lot of talk, for a long time, about reining in Iran's nuclear ambitions. Far too many countries have found Iran's oil wealth simply too hard to resist. There are encouraging signs that for at least some major players, patience with Tehran may be running out.

A week after the United Nations Security Council approved a fourth round of sanctions on Iran, the European Union adopted even tougher penalties. Japan, South Korea and Australia are expected to follow soon.

American sanctions on Iran — many dating from the 1979 Islamic Revolution — are already the most stringent in the world. But four years after the Security Council first ordered Iran to stop enriching uranium, Europe is still Iran's biggest trading partner.

The latest Security Council sanctions are primarily focused on cutting off Iran's access to the international financial system and ending dealings with the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps, which runs Iran's illicit nuclear program and much more. The resolution still gives countries too much discretion. It calls on — rather than requires — states to close Iranian banks with any links to the country's nuclear or missile programs. And it urges them to deny insurance coverage to Iranian shipping and other businesses with any links to proliferation.

At a meeting this week in Brussels, European heads of state adopted rules that could close many of those potential gaps and added more restrictions, banning European companies from making new investments in, or otherwise assisting, Iran's oil and gas industry.

European ministers will now have to decide which Iranian companies are off limits and which European products and deals are affected. We are sure there will be considerable lobbying in Brussels by countries and companies to let favourites off the hook. The leaders need to instruct their ministers to hang tough.

That means closing all of Iran's suspect banking operations in Europe and strictly limiting business between European and Iranian banks. It means banning all business with Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps-affiliated entities (no matter how hard the Iranians try to disguise those links) and sanctioning European companies that violate this prohibition. It also means banning European companies from selling insurance services to any Iranian entities with ties to the Revolutionary Guards or the nuclear program.

European banks have been gradually weaning themselves from business with Iran, and industry giants like Siemens of Germany say they will make no new investments there. But Siemens also has insisted on fulfilling existing contracts, raising doubts about its sincerity.

Russia has played a cynical double game with Iran for far too long, watering down sanctions resolutions and then ignoring them. So we were — cautiously — encouraged when Prime Minister Vladimir Putin of Russia told France last week that Russia would freeze the planned delivery of S-300 air defence missiles to Iran. (American officials say that is not required under the United Nations sanctions.) We found it encouraging that the state oil company, Lukoil, has announced it is dropping an Iranian oil project. Those commitments will need to be closely monitored.

China — despite voting for all four rounds of sanctions — is increasing its investments in Iran. Washington, Moscow and Brussels all need to call Beijing out.

As it pressed its offer of engagement, the Obama administration intentionally downplayed possible punishments for Tehran. Iran's leaders have responded with bluster and insults — all the while churning out more enriched uranium. On Wednesday, the White House blacklisted more than a dozen additional Iranian companies and individuals with links to Tehran's illicit nuclear and missile programs.

Congress — rarely known for its subtlety on such matters — is working on its own, even tougher sanctions legislation. Details are still being negotiated, but it is expected to call for punishing foreign companies that sell refined gasoline to Iran and do other business there. At a time when Europe is finally putting some real pressure on Iran, any bill must be worded very carefully and give the White House sufficient waiver power.

Source: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/19/opinion/19sat1.html?ref=editorials>



People's Democracy

(Weekly Organ of the Communist Party of India (Marxist))

New Delhi, Editorial, 20 June 2010, Sunday

20. Iran Sanctions: US Steps up Confrontation

THE UN Security Council has adopted a resolution imposing the fourth round of sanctions on Iran. The United States succeeded in getting the four other permanent members to back the resolution. By this step, the US and the Western powers have signalled that rather than engaging with Iran on the nuclear issue confrontation will be their path. The sanctions are targeted at Iran's military and nuclear industry. It also extends sanctions on individuals and entities. Around 40 more companies have been blacklisted.

What is surprising is that these sanctions have come immediately after the successful diplomatic initiative by Brazil and Turkey in getting an agreement with Iran whereby the latter agreed to transfer 1200 kilograms of low enriched uranium fuel to Turkey. This would be held in escrow till Iran receives processed nuclear fuel for the Teheran Research Reactor for medical purposes. President Lula of Brazil and Prime Minister Erdogan of Turkey visited Teheran to get this agreement through. This agreement was on the lines proposed by the US through the IAEA in October 2008.

The United States decried the agreement as not good enough. It announced that the resolution on sanctions will be put before the Security Council. That the United States was going back on its own stand and proposal became clear when the letter sent by President Obama to President Lula was released by the Brazilian government. In that letter as recent as April 20, 2010, Obama refers to his meeting with Lula and Erdogan during the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington. In the letter Obama clearly states that: "For us, Iran's agreement to transfer 1200 kg of Iran's low enriched uranium (LEU) out of the country would build confidence and reduce regional tensions by substantially reducing Iran's LEU stockpile". Further the letter states, "There is a potentially important compromise that has already been offered. Last November, the IAEA conveyed to Iran our offer to allow Iran to ship its 1200 kg of LEU to a third country – specifically Turkey – at the outset of the process to be held "in escrow" as a guarantee during the fuel production process that Iran would get back its uranium if we failed to deliver the fuel."

Yet when Brazil and Turkey got Iran to agree to precisely this proposal, the United States backed out. President Obama has come out in a bad light in this episode. The argument advanced by the US is that at the time of the offer in October 2008, 1200 kg represented three quarters of Iran's low enriched uranium stock and since then it has produced more. So, now, 1200 kg represents only half the stock. This is putting out an argument for arguments sake to scuttle the agreement. This agreement would have meant the beginning of an arrangement and a dialogue to settle outstanding issues with the IAEA.

The sanctions resolution was not unanimous in the Security Council. It was opposed by Brazil and Turkey who voted against and Lebanon who abstained. China got some of wider ranging sanctions deleted; it did not agree to sanctions in the energy sector. Questions will remain why the permanent members, apart from the Western powers, supported this resolution after the Tehran agreement provided the opening to break the stalemate.

This current episode speaks a lot about the Obama administration's Middle-East policy. It continues the policy of outright support to Israel despite expressing reservations on the extension of the illegal settlements. It was muted in regretting the attack on the Gaza flotilla and the loss of lives and is against any international probe into the matter. Finally, it is keeping pace with Israel's implacable hostility to Iran.

India had gone on record that it does not think sanctions are the way to tackle the problem. But India had fallen in line with the United States whenever Iran was targeted in the IAEA. It is the IAEA resolution which opened the way for sanctions by the Security Council. The US keeps patting India on the back for this stance. As a result of US pressure, India backed out of finalising the Iran gas pipe line project. Even now the UPA government should realise that India's true interest lies in strengthening relations with Iran and extending our economic and trade ties especially in the energy sector. India should find ways to pursue this course without the sanctions becoming a hindrance.

Source: http://pd.cpim.org/2010/0620_pd/06202010_2.html

Lipika Kamra is a research student at the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

As part of its editorial policy, the MEI@ND standardizes spelling and date formats to make the text uniformly accessible and stylistically consistent.

The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views/positions of the MEI@ND. Editor, MEI Editorials Watch: P R Kumaraswamy