

(Contd. from p. 1)

## U.S. ...

fanned the flames of war in southern and western Sudan with the goal of eventually partitioning the country into three states to facilitate the Zionist regime's efforts to establish a presence in the Upper Nile region and Ethiopia.

The Sudanese government had long warned about the Zionist regime's plots in Africa, and especially in Ethiopia.

Sudan's vigilance about the Western and Zionist plots prompted the extra-regional powers to employ a variety of methods to isolate the Khartoum government.

Foreign powers put pressure on Sudan to allow the UN and the African Union to deploy peacekeeping forces in Darfur, ostensibly to protect the residents.

To show its goodwill, Sudan finally agreed to allow foreign troops to enter its soil. However, the West, and particularly the United States, has been undermining the government's efforts to rebuild the areas devastated by the war.

And now Washington has begun pressuring the ICC to issue an arrest warrant for the legitimate president of Sudan.

Since the court is only authorized to investigate war crimes, it should try war criminals like U.S. President George W. Bush, former British prime minister Tony Blair, and Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert for the war crimes they have committed in Iraq, Afghanistan, Palestine, and Lebanon.

ICC officials are allowing the U.S. to use the organization as a tool for the implementation of its policies, and thus the ICC has no authority to issue an arrest warrant for the Sudanese president.

In fact, the United States never signed the treaty which established the International Criminal Court and has warned that it will take action against any country that tries to extradite a U.S. citizen to the ICC, which shows the hypocrisy of the latest U.S. moves.

Following are excerpts of the telephonic interview:

(Contd. from p. 1)

## Ahmadinejad ...

"Iran welcomes any proposal for improving ties even from the White House leaders," the president asserted.

Washington Post had earlier reported that the Bush administration is considering setting up a diplomatic outpost in Iran in what would mark a dramatic official U.S. return to the country nearly 30 years after the two nations severed relations.

Asked about the report about opening a mission in Iran, the president said, "We have not yet received any official request in this regard."

"But Iran had previously proposed starting direct flights between the two countries so that hundreds of thousands of passengers including students, academics, and business travelers can directly fly to the two states," he added.

Now, the U.S. has no diplomatic presence in Iran and relies on the Swiss Embassy in Tehran to pass messages to the Iranian Foreign Ministry on Washington's behalf and handle the affairs of U.S. citizens in the country.

(Contd. from p. 1)

## Iran ...

Earlier this month the Islamic Republic provided its response to a letter by the United States, Britain, France, China, Russia, and Germany on ending the West's prolonged nuclear standoff with Iran.

Tehran has refused to freeze its uranium enrichment work as a precondition for talks and has said that it will only negotiate on the common points presented in the two separate packages.

(Contd. from p. 1)

## Canada ...

Mr. Malaskiewicz-Blaise attracted the attention of the U.S. Secret Service when he drew cartoons and made satirical remarks about George W. Bush and his family. Based on these cartoons and satirical remarks, he was then charged with threatening the president of the United States. The U.S. federal government also ordered a mental health examination by a politically-connected Secret Service employee.

He was diagnosed with schizophrenia and ordered to take the antipsychotic medications Haldol and Seroquel.

The government coerced Malaskiewicz-Blaise into pleading guilty with empty promises. After he pleaded guilty, the government cooked up a pre-sentence report full of contradictions and lies. This report was in turn used to justify greatly increasing his prison sentence.

After serving his time in prison as well as probation, Malaskiewicz-Blaise traveled to Canada to claim political asylum. The Canadian government has detained Mr. Malaskiewicz-Blaise for over a year and is treating him as a terrorist based on his political and religious views and the exaggerated claims of the U.S. government.

Psychologist David L. B. Woodbury of the West Montreal Counselling Centre has held face-to-face sessions and spoken on the phone with Mr. Malaskiewicz-Blaise.

On June 6, 2008, Mr. Woodbury wrote a report in which he stated, "In sum, in both face-to-face and telephonic interviews, his non-verbal communication and the content of his speech were entirely consistent with the hypothesis that he has been misdiagnosed as psychotic, or that he is in complete remission and has faced considerable injustices in his homeland."

Elsewhere in the report, Mr. Woodbury wrote, "There were no signs of psychosis or delusional thinking."

Carl Malaskiewicz-Blaise spoke to the Tehran Times on July 9 from the phone room of the Laval Centre for the Prevention of Immigration.

Following are excerpts of the telephonic interview:

"My lawyer does not believe that I suffer from a mental illness. However, I have been forced to take medication — Seroquel — for an illness I don't have. I have been wrongly diagnosed by U.S. and Canadian government psychiatrists between 2000 and 2008. They said my political views were delusions when they were simply opinions. I believe I was tricked into signing a plea agreement in September 2001 and the U.S. government used false information, fraud, and deception to railroad me into prison for about five years."

"I was released from the U.S. prison in April 2005."

"I fled to Canada in 2007 and I sought asylum there, but the Canadian government placed me in an immigration detention center near Montreal where I have been detained since May 2007."

"I was jailed in the U.S. for about five years because a Secret Service psychiatrist had labeled me delusional. I was first sent to a federal medical detention center for the criminally insane, but I was released from that institution because I was deemed to be not criminally insane, and then I was sent to the Alexandria Detention Center in Virginia."

"9/11 happened and I was tricked into signing a plea agreement under the threat of receiving a sentence of 20 years in prison if I didn't."

"The mainstream media in the U.S. and Canada have been biased and they won't touch my story, except for a few small AM radio talk shows and the Washington, D.C.-based weekly newspaper the American Free Press."

More information on Mr. Malaskiewicz-Blaise's case is available at the web site [www.freecar.com](http://www.freecar.com).

(Contd. from p. 1)

## Sanctions ...

security council action". Sanctions are never timely or decisive. They are a political demonstration. While the decision will be greeted with glee by Robert Mugabe, Britain's UN ambassador, John Sawers, should never have proposed them as offering the Zimbabwean people "an end in sight to their miseries". They offer no such thing.

Unlike war, which is violence aimed at conquering and replacing a regime, merely engineering a shift in terms of trade is play-acting. As a gesture of soft power, sanctions were first imposed on Italy during the Abyssinian crisis of 1935 and did not work. Yet their appeal is undiminished. Macho in rhetoric yet painless to the imposing nation, they replace guns and bombs with trade returns and computers.

History offers one generalization: that sanctions add longevity to anyone on whom the West imposes them. The most sanctioned leaders of the past half-century have been Fidel Castro, Colonel Gaddafi, Saddam Hussein, ..., the Taliban, the Burmese generals and the rulers of North Korea. None was brought down by them. Where intervention was effective, as in the Falklands, Haiti, Afghanistan, Serbia and Iraq, it required force.

Nothing is more arrogant than a powerful nation's belief in the efficacy of all it does. If a sanction is imposed and does not achieve its goal, it was not tough enough. If the goal does occur, then its sanctions must have been the cause. Such is the West's omnipotence that lesser states must always be dancing to its tune. Whenever there is trouble in the world, said Kipling, "An' then comes up the Regiment an' pokes the 'eathen out" — even if the regiment is nowadays a trade regulator.

Students of sanctions remain mystified by their appeal. They are near impossible to make leak-proof and just establish more costly and corrupt conduits of trade. Kofi Annan of the UN calls them a "blunt and even counterproductive instrument".

The most detailed examination, by Richard Haass of the Brookings Institution for Congress in 1999, concluded that they were so blunt as "often to produce unintentional and undesirable consequences", such as strengthening the regime they were supposed to be undermining. Free trade economies are by their nature open and thus susceptible to pressure. Besieged ones are authoritarian and closed against pressure.

This has not stopped South Africa being constantly cited as a prize exhibit of the sanctions lobby. Through the 1980s that country experienced comprehensive (although not leak-proof) embargoes on trade and finance. This was indeed followed by regime change, albeit some 10 years later. Those involved in impos-omy. Financial sanctions and, later, disinvestment complicated credit lines, but the central bank behaved responsibly in controlling money supply, unlike Zimbabwe's. Ownership of foreign food, retail and car manufacturing shifted into Afrikaner hands. Profit was no longer exported to America and Europe.

Studying sanctions at the time, I concluded that they helped to prolong the white regime by as much as a decade, shifting power from more liberal to less liberal groups. Sanctions did not weaken the regime.

Ostracism hurt the pockets and the pride of many cosmopolitan South Africans — the sort westerners meet — but they did not hurt half as much as socialism hurt the rest of Africa. South Africa under sanctions was not poor in African terms. Its leaders decided in 1989-90 to transfer power peacefully to blacks, largely because they thought it was safe to do so. A body of white opinion found

apartheid intellectually and morally unsupportable.

In so far as South Africa felt under pressure it was not economic but military. As long as Nelson Mandela was in prison he was a catalyst for terrorism, as was the presence of hostile regimes along the northern border. Sanctions "worked" only for those outside the country, such as America's Jesse Jackson, determined to cast themselves as agents and heroes of change. They were as patronizing as they were wrong.

Sanctions may not make a country wealthy in the longer term, but they can make a regime more secure in the short one. They also enrich its ruling elite. Sanctions made Saddam the sixth richest man in the world and Serbia's Milosevic the king of a mafia organization. They are pouring money into the pockets of the cronies of Mugabe, and the Burmese generals.

The recent drift from general sanctions into "smart" ones is a measure of their futility. But smart sanctions are no less absurd. In South Africa the exclusion from Test matches did not lead Afrikaners to vote for progressive MPs. The idea that Mugabe might decide to stand down because his wife cannot shop at Harrods is simply absurd.

The threat of economic siege drives a nation towards state power, as does the threat of terrorism in the West. It makes governments behave more not less repressively and the populace become more not less dependent on it. The middle-class customary reservoir of opposition to dictatorship is debilitated and driven into exile, as happened in Iraq.

That impoverishing the poor and inconveniencing the rich somehow leads to bloody revolution must be the most brainless concept ever to pollute international relations. People rarely rise up and topple governments and if they do it is at the point of a gun, usually their own. Violence works. Economics does not.

The appeal of sanctions is that they are a quick answer to public opinion demanding that "something must be done", something that does not mean body bags. They are war by other means, bloodcurdling but not bloodthirsty. But they are co-workers' war because those they hurt, usually the poor, are also defenseless. Zimbabwe's sanctions are inducing its regime to ensure that only its supporters have food. That may make our Foreign Office feel better but what good does it do?

The last desperate cry of the sanctions lobby is: if not sanctions, what? It is as if any gesture were better than none. The truth is that if you want to overthrow a regime you should do it, as the Victorians did. If not, stop pretending.

In 1925, after the great war, the international community outlawed chemical weapons as repellent even in total war. The agreement was remarkably successful, at least until Saddam's day. So too was a similar revulsion against nuclear weapons after Hiroshima. There is honor even among warmongers.

Perhaps one day economic sanctions, a weapon of international conflict that uniquely attacks civilians, might also be removed from the arsenal.

(The Sunday Times)

(Contd. from p. 13)

## Cristiano ...

It took a player as captivated by himself as Ronaldo to do that. But there are plenty of others with a penchant for recognizing only what suits them in a contract, for persuading themselves that, when richer pickings are available elsewhere, a sense of obligation is for simpletons and formal agreements are there to be broken. Now the egregious Blatter (who not long ago was demanding respect for player-club contracts) has contrived to give such anarchy his stamp of approval. Fortunately his reputation for buffoonery invalidated his comments as soon they were delivered but they

were grossly offensive nevertheless.

Some of his critics were probably excessively eager to relate his remarks to hell-ships crammed with human cargo or slavemasters working their purchases to death. No doubt Blatter should have been sensitive to the deepest resonances of talk about slavery but such terrible images weren't needed to expose the grotesquerie of his language. All that was required was recollection of the conditions that prevailed in English football less than 50 years ago in the era of the maximum wage (£20 a week as late as 1960), the vicious retain-and-transfer system and the club houses from which families of discarded players could be evicted at a fortnight's notice. In those days footballers were held, if not in slavery, then certainly in something close to feudal serfdom. No-body would suggest that anyone in modern football should be remotely influenced by such distant history. But if Blatter and Ronaldo acquainted themselves with it they would surely keep their fantasizing in check — and might even doff their dustbin lids.

*Hugh McLvanney is the most respected voice in British sports journalism, voted the best in his profession on seven different occasions by his peers, and the author of numerous books on football, boxing and horseracing.*

(The Sunday Times)

(Contd. from p. 1)

## Accept ...

of his sprawling city, home to 8 million by night, swelling to 11 million by day.

But the 46-year-old former police chief is just as eager to talk of Iran's nuclear program, its troubled relationship with the United States and its geopolitical role in the Middle East.

"The United States and the West make the mistake that they can still go back to before the (1979 Islamic) revolution," he told Reuters in an interview in his imposing ninth-floor town hall office. "They should completely forget this."

Qalibaf said Iran's foes should acknowledge that the almost 30-year-old system was a democratic expression of the Iranian people's will and reflected their religious beliefs.

"If the Westerners accept this, deal with this fact, Iran should accept to act in the international framework and act based on international regulations," he declared.

Qalibaf, who said he has yet to decide whether to run in next year's presidential election, argued that Iran and the United States shared security interests in a volatile, energy-rich region.

But prospects for any understanding were blocked by U.S. "double standards" on democracy, terrorism and women's rights, as well as on the nuclear dispute, which has roiled oil markets worried about war.

"Iran is a fact in the region. They should resolve those issues correctly, not by trying to eliminate or ignore Iran."

Qalibaf said a national consensus existed on Iran's need for peaceful nuclear technology, but acknowledged differences over what tactics to adopt in the conflict with the West.

"How are we going to assure the world that we are not after nuclear weapons?" he asked. "Iranians want to give this assurance to the world and have interaction with the world."

Qalibaf, a commander of Iran's Basij volunteers in the 1980-88 war with Iraq, said he doubted the United States would attack Iranian nuclear sites, given its military entanglements in the crises plaguing neighboring Iraq and Afghanistan.

"We believe the Americans would never act so unwisely as to do the same with Iran as they did with Iraq and Afghanistan."

Qalibaf viewed even limited U.S. military operations as unlikely because Iran would respond forcefully. "Starting this might be in the hands of the Americans, but not finishing it," he said, adding that diplomacy offered a more rational option.

Yet while favoring talks on an incentives package offered last month by world powers Qalibaf saw little chance of Iran conceding their demand that it suspend uranium enrichment — a process that can make material for power stations or warheads.

"It's unlikely," he said when asked if Iran could suspend enrichment, without giving up its right to master the nuclear fuel cycle, so that negotiations on the package could begin.

Qalibaf, who succeeded Mahmoud Ahmadinejad as mayor of Tehran after losing to him in the presidential election three years ago, faulted some government economic policies.

Asked if inflation, now running at 26 percent, had affected the Tehran municipality, he said it was a problem, but one that was foreseeable because of liquidity injected into the system.

Ahmadinejad has been widely criticized for fuelling inflation by freely spending to try to meet his promises to put Iran's oil wealth on the tables of his low-income compatriots.

Qalibaf also groused that Tehran was not getting the funding it expected from the treasury. "We even think the government is imposing some financial issues on the municipality," he said.

The mayor, credited by many in Tehran as an effective manager, said he was grappling with the runaway growth of a city whose infrastructure had not been planned for rapid expansion.

But he cited progress on planning, interaction with citizens via local councils and hotlines, and delivery of services.

Qalibaf said he had not yet decided whether to have another tilt at the presidency in next year's June election.

Asked about his ambitions after his term as mayor, he said only: "It's unlikely that a political figure has no plans."