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Peter Robinson: Welcome to Uncommon Knowledge. I'm Peter Robinson. Our show today, Economic Sanctions. We Americans have been practicing sanctions for a long time now. The first target of our sanctions, tea. In 1773, American colonists imposed an embargo against British tea, an act of protest against British domination of the thirteen colonies. The Americans wanted to prevent British tea from being imported into the colonies. And when British ships carrying tea did manage to land well, remember the Boston Tea Party? Americans crept onto the ships in the middle of the night and heaved the tea overboard. Did the sanctions work? Not exactly. The British never gave into American demands and the ultimate outcome was war. More than two hundred years later, we face the same question. Do economic sanctions work? In recent years, the United States has had sanctions against countries such as Yugoslavia, Iraq and Cuba. Have those sanctions furthered our foreign policy aims or merely imposed suffering on the people of those countries?

With us today, three guests. David Cortright is co-author of the book, The Sanctions Decade. Richard Becker is with the International Action Center. And Michael Nacht is Dean of the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley.

Title: The Shipping News

Peter Robinson: Senator Jesse Helms, I quote, "There are three tools in foreign policy, diplomacy, sanctions and war. Without sanctions, the United States would be virtually powerless to influence events, absent war." Pope John Paul, II, again I quote, "Economic embargoes are always deplorable because they hurt the most needy," closed quote. Who's right? Jesse Helms or the pope?

Richard Becker: The pope.
Peter Robinson: The pope. Michael?

Michael Nacht: They're both right.

Peter Robinson: They're both right.

Michael Nacht: (?) sanctions hurt the poor but they're an essential part of foreign policy.

Peter Robinson: But they're not always deplorable? You're correcting the pope at least to that extent?

Michael Nacht: Correct.

Peter Robinson: David?

David Cortright: I would think they're both right except for it's possible to ha--impose sanctions without hurting the poor through…

Peter Robinson: It is?

David Cortright: …more targeted, so-called smart sanctions.

Peter Robinson: Okay. In congressional testimony not too long ago, Secretary of State, Colin Powell, stated that he intends to conduct a complete review of the sanctions the United States already has in place to see which ones can be lifted. Let me quote Colin Powell. "I'd encourage the congress to stop for a while. When you're mad about something, please stop, count to ten, call me. Let's talk about it before you slap another bureaucratic process on me." Closed quote. Let's roll through then, a couple of case studies, three case studies if you can, Yugoslavia, Iraq and Cuba and see if we can tease out some fundamental principles, some ways of thinking about sanctions that we can put into an envelope and send to Colin Powell as he conducts his review. Yugoslavia, the United States has im--imposed sanctions on Yugoslavia in 1992 and put them on and took them off but they were mostly on until January of 2001. And Slobodan Milosevic, the strong man against whom the sanctions were substantially directed, was indeed forced from power. So Michael, sanctions worked in Yugoslavia?

Michael Nacht: I believe so. I think they were an essential part of U.S. policy in Yugoslavia. I supported it throughout--un--until Milosevic was removed.

Peter Robinson: Well what do you say to this? Spring of 1999, the United States and NATO allies bombed Yugoslavia for seventy-eight days, dropping more than twenty-three thousand bombs. How do you respond to the argument that it wasn't the sanctions that worked, it was the bombing?

Michael Nacht: It's a mix. It's very hard to disentangle cause and effect on some of these things. And again, not that I fully support what Jesse Helms has to say on most subjects
but, you know, it's an element of American foreign policy. It's used sometimes effectively and sometimes not effectively.

Peter Robinson: And, in Yugoslavia, it was a healthy use of shanc--sanctions…

Michael Nacht: Absolutely.

Peter Robinson: It contributed to a good end result.

Michael Nacht: Are people--are people being heard in the process? Absolutely. But it did ultimately lead to a disen--disenfranchise of the support for Milosevic and his ouster and a free election. Absolutely.

Peter Robinson: A legitimate and successful use of sanctions, Richard?

Richard Becker: I don't think the sanctions were--that were directed against Slobodan Milosevic as an individual. I think they were directed toward weakening Iraq as a--weakening Yugoslavia as a country, decimating its society. It succeeded very well in doing that. All comprehensive sanctions of this sort do devastate the most vulnerable members of society and the very young, the very old, those who are sick. And sanctions cannot be distinguished from war. Sanctions, under international law, if we want to talk about international law, that are enforced by military blockade are, in fact, an act of war. I think that's very clear. And the sanctions and the bombing were intermixed, the blockade and the bombing were intermixed in order to devastate that country. And they succeeded in doing that.

Peter Robinson: What about the bombing? Was that legitimate to--to prevent a Yugoslavia from going into Kosovo?

Richard Becker: No, it was not legitimate because the great numbers of refugees that were engendered were engendered, in fact, following the bombing. And that's according to the State Department's statistics themselves. I think that what we had was a decision in Washington to go to war. It was evidenced by the Rambouillet agreement which was an agreement that no sovereign country could accept. Madeleine Albright said herself, we set the bar too high for the Serbs to accept…

Peter Robinson: Try to force it down…

[Talking at same time]

Richard Becker: …get some bombing.

Peter Robinson: Milosevic was thrown out.

Richard Becker: That's right.
David Cortright: Peter, can I inter…

Peter Robinson: Yes, please do, please do, please do.

David Cortright: I think, first of all, we have to distinguish. There were two episodes of sanctions. There were the UN sanctions in '92 through '95.

Peter Robinson: In which we participated?

David Cortright: In which we participated. Then there were the predominantly U.S. and EU, European Union sanctions in '98 through 2000. The first episode, I think, did play a significant role in helping to bring out the negotiated settlement of the Bosnia war. And those sanctions were about…

Peter Robinson: The date records…

David Cortright: the Bosnia war. The date records…

Peter Robinson: At which point the UN lifts the sanction.

David Cortright: Exactly. A flawed agreement admittedly but at least you can say that the sanctions were an--a central part of the bargaining pressure applied on the Milosevic regime that brought them to the table and helped bring about this agreement.

Peter Robinson: 1997, five years…

Peter Robinson: If sanctions were only partially effective in Yugoslavia, were they worth the impact they had on the civilian population?

Title: Stuck in the Middle With You

Peter Robinson: 1997, five years after those sanctions were imposed, nearly a third of Yugoslavs were unemployed. Was it worth the price?

David Cortright: It had a--it had a huge economic impact but there was also the economic impact of the wars, not only in Cr--Croatia and Bosnia and the short--short one, Slovenia. And also the tremendous dislocation within Yugoslavia, populations moving back and forth. So there were multiple factors…

Peter Robinson: Lot of reasons for economic…

David Cortright: …that contributed to the economic decline…

Peter Robinson: …decline.

David Cortright: …as well as the inept policies of the state government itself.
Peter Robinson: But the sanctions did inde--deed contribute…

David Cortright: Certainly contributed to the decline.

Peter Robinson: It was still legitimate and successful.

David Cortright: However, they did not cause--there is no evidence that the sanctions in Yugoslavia caused anything like a severe humanitarian impact that we have seen in Iraq. We have done studies on this. There's a news…

Peter Robinson: Nobody starved in Yugoslavia as a result of…

[Talking at same time]

David Cortright: Exactly. There's a new study that's just being done by Richard Garfield. Again, it's gone through the data. There's no evidence of increased infant mortality or higher mor--morbidity among children or older folks because of these sanctions.

Richard Becker: It raised the--it raised the inflation rate fifteen months later to several quadrillion percent…

David Cortright: There were severe economic impacts.

Richard Becker: If we talk about--if we think about that, what impact that has, the wages of ordinary employees, workers, were totally wiped out to a large degree. And medicine was in very short supply in many of the hospitals. The healthcare system was considered the best in Southern Europe. It was devastated by those sanctions. And I think that is unconscionable to impose sanctions of this sort against the whole people when we know that the most vulnerable members of society are the ones who will die and who will suffer.

David Cortright: Let's talk about the second wave of sanctions.

Peter Robinson: Go ahead. Go ahead.

David Cortright: I think points that Richards raises on the generality of the sanctions is accurate for the first phase. The second phase pre--predominantly through the European Union those were much more targeted sanctions. And so these…

Peter Robinson: Sanctions against, give us categories.

David Cortright: It was arms embargo, travel ban on--designated list of about eight hundred top officials in Yugoslavia and on the Yugoslav airline. There were financial sanctions. So the financial accounts of the Yugoslav government and then a designated list of about eight hundred top officials were frozen. All transactions were pro--
prohibited. There was an investment ban. There were a series of measured, targeted sanctions.

**Peter Robinson:** But you could still ship goods in and out of Yugoslavia. Medicines can go in.

**David Cortright:** A lot of open civilian trade and that stuff could go on but…

**Peter Robinson:** Okay.

**David Cortright:** …these restrictions were very specifically targeted on the top leaders of the regime as a way of exerting pressure to ease up these tremendous human rights abuses. And I--I think--I disagree with Richard's characterization of the whole Yugoslavia conflict. It was in place. One of the most abusive regimes in all of Europe, guilty of tremendous human rights abuses and to not play a role in that struggle, I think, would have been unconscionable.

**Peter Robinson:** But the second…

**David Cortright:** Many of the human rights groups in this country and around the world were urging more vigorous sanctions, more effort on the part of the international community.

**Peter Robinson:** The--the second set of sanctions which were targeted. You maintain $A$, that they did not harm the populous, the ordinary Yugoslav to the dramatic extent that as--that--that the first set of sanctions did.

**David Cortright:** First phase was worse, yes.

**Peter Robinson:** And you also maintain that they were however, nevertheless successful and contributed to forcing Milosevic from power.

**David Cortright:** Well again, I think my…

**Peter Robinson:** Or do targeted sanctions just have less impact on…

[Talking at same time]

**David Cortright:** Michael's point, I agree with. How can you--you can't define the causality here and with specificity. What caused the removal of Milosevic? There were multiple factors. I think the primary credit goes to the people of Serbia themselves who…

**Peter Robinson:** But can't I just suggest that if you're not pretty sure that your sanctions are going to contribute in a very significant way to the political end that you have in mind, you have no business imposing those sanctions.
David Cortright: Well…

Peter Robinson: I mean to say, look we're imposing very serious sanctions. Travel restrictions, we're tying up financial accounts. We're going to impose an arms embargo but eh, who knows, politics is confusing.

David Cortright: Well no, you want that goal to be achieved but you can't be certain of it and there are other factors that are involved. And, in this case, the fact that there was a strong civil opposition in Serbia, a democratic opposition which eventually managed to get this guy out…

[Talking at same time]

Peter Robinson: So foreign policy is messy--foreign policy is messy. You use the tools at hand and clumsy though it may be, sanctions is one of the tools.

David Cortright: I think so.

Peter Robinson: Okay.

Michael Nacht: Well, I mean, Milosevic was the single most significant threat to human rights in Europe since Hitler. More people were ethnically cleansed. More people were detained. More people were murdered. More people were evicted under Milosevic than any other single European leader since 1945.

Peter Robinson: And inaction…

Michael Nacht: For a long time, the U.S. did nothing. The U…

Peter Robinson: And that was the outrage?

Michael Nacht: …the U.S. and the European…

Peter Robinson: Let's move onto our next case study, sanctions against Iraq.

Title: Between Iraq and a Hard Place

Peter Robinson: We imposed sanctions on Iraq. After the Gulf War, the Iraqi economy is shrunk by at least forty percent. Inflation is soared into at least triple digits. Quotation from the foreign policy strategist, Richard Pearl, quote, "The use of sanctions seems to me to be quite the opposite of the use of precision guided munitions. The target is generally a handful of people at the top of some foreign regime but these people are hardly inconvenienced while their subjects suffer substantial damage. Many Iraqis are suffering terribly yet there is no sign that Saddam Hussein is either suffering personally or inclined to retire gracefully." Closed quote. Michael, American sanctions against Iraq have been useless in dislodging Saddam Hussein and a crime against the Iraqi people.
Michael Nacht: They--they've been amazingly ineffective. A lot of people have suffered terribly. The Bush Administration is reviewing how to adjust U.S. policy toward Iraq to try to reduce the suffering but keep the pressure on Saddam Hussein.

Peter Robinson: You'd go with Pearl? This is a crime against the Iraqi people?

Richard Becker: I've been to Iraq twice and I've also been to Yugoslavia and Cuba. I've seen the effect of these sanctions firsthand. It's an incredible, unbelievable catastrophe for the people. And it's a disaster but it's not a natural made one. It's a human made one. The policymakers know exactly what they're doing. They're not just targeting the leaders of the country. They say that for public consumption. They are targeting the people and the country and they're seeking to weaken Iraq because of the long-term U.S. aim of dominating this region and Iraq stands in the way of that.

Peter Robinson: You--you…

David Cortright: The Iraq sanctions have had a devastating impact socially. Infant mortality has at least doubled over the last ten years. The number of people who have died, mostly children and the most vulnerable, prematurely is at least several hundred thousand. The numbers, you know, well it's hard to specify but it is one of the great horrors of human rights of recent history.

Peter Robinson: So in the name of disli--of a futile effort to dislodge Saddam Hussein, the United States and its allies have caused several hundred thousand people to die prematurely?

David Cortright: Right but the goal of the sanctions, the UN sanctions is not to dislodge Saddam Hussein. It is to get compliance with the Gulf War cease fire resolutions specifically to get agreement on the dismantlement of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction.

Peter Robinson: Have they worked?

David Cortright: To some extent in that regard, you have to say they have. That is to say…

Peter Robinson: Have they been worth the price?

David Cortright: No, no.

Peter Robinson: Have they worked?

Michael Nacht: The--only partially because once the inspectors were forced out in December of '98, no one knows except for Saddam Hussein and a few of his generals, the nature of their current weapons of mass destruction program. But it's clearly much more than zero and that already is a significant violation of the agreement…
Peter Robinson: Okay. Here's the way David Cortright has characterized the present situation. I'm quoting you David, "Evidence of eroding compliance is everywhere. International flights stream into Baghdad, airline passenger service is resumed to between Jordan and Iraq. Russia, France and other countries are pressuring to lift trade sanctions." Closed quote. Aware of all this Colin Powell's statement is that we will, quote, "work with our allies to reenergize sanctions against Iraq." That's crazy, isn't it?

David Cortright: Well the strategy that's underway now, I think, is a sound one if it can be pulled off. That is to say, what Powell and a lot of member states at the United Nations want is to lift the civilian sanctions. There's no reason to continue this embargo against the Iraqi people. It's absolutely unconscionable and unnecessary to the more focused purpose which is to con--contain the regime of Saddam Hussein militarily.

Peter Robinson: So you lift the civilian sanctions and do what?

David Cortright: Lift the civilian sanctions and focus on the arms embargo, make sure that there is a rigorous arms embargo so that no weapons, no dual use military related goods can enter Iraq. It's a complicated process. It requires monitoring around the borders. It requires the cooperation of the neighboring states like Syria and Jordan.

Peter Robinson: But you believe it can be done?

David Cortright: I think it can be done. We've just done a study to try to outline that. The Brookings Institution has done a study. The UN is grappling with this right now and they'll know…

Peter Robinson: That's what you'd recommend?

Michael Nacht: Very tough nut because--primarily because Saddam Hussein has cleverly exploited the economic benefits to others of trading with him.

Peter Robinson: Targeted sanctions?

Richard Becker: Well I--no, I don't think so. I think that what we're talking about, targeted sanctions or untargeted sanctions, it requires a military blockade to do it and I think that David Cortright's plan is illustrative of that, maintaining the monitoring. That's a code word for blockade. That's a code word for a military enforced sanctions against the country. And just to give you this example, the main reason that people die today in Iraq is because of lack of clean water. It's not lack of food and medicine. It's lack of clean water. The UN, at the insistence of the United States has insist--has said over and over again, no pipe, no water pumps, no chlorine, none of the essentials that are necessary to rebuild Iraq's destroyed water and sewage treatment system. Until that happens, the people, the children especially, will keep dying.
Peter Robinson: David? Go ahead.

David Cortright: In that--in that program I--I agree with you. That--there's no reason to restrict those items. And we've been urging, we've been meeting with the U.S. officials and State Department and elsewhere that to maintain any of those controls over these civilian groups is absolutely unnecessary.

Peter Robinson: David's saying, let them rebuild their sewage plants, let them rebuild their water treatment plants, let medicines go in, let trade of all kinds resume with Iraq but no weapons trade. Will you buy that?

Richard Becker: No. David--the problem is David isn't going to decide which goods get in or not and the big problem is then--captured in the word "dual use." Dual use is used by the security council, at the security council to deny contract after contract after contract because they say, well pipe can be used for military purposes. Chlorine can…

Peter Robinson: Let me ask you this…

Peter Robinson: Onto our last case study, the longstanding American embargo against Cuba.

Title: Buena Vista Sanctions Club

Peter Robinson: We've had an economic embargo against Cuba for some four decades now. Fidel Castro is still in power. He's trading with every other nation on earth except Israel. There's only one country that supports our economic embargo of Cuba and that's Israel. He even seems, we can't tell but he--and don't hold your breath until he holds an election or permits a public opinion poll but he even seems to have the support of large sectors of his populous. So our embargo against Cuba. There you have a clean case in which sanctions have been a total failure. Yes?

Michael Nacht: Yes and that's a subject about domestic politics in the United States. That's not a subject…

Peter Robinson: But the sanctions, as a matter of foreign policy, have--have failed?

Michael Nacht: Correct.

Peter Robinson: Okay. David?

David Cortright: Absolutely, I think it's a completely ridiculous policy. It has no basis in international law. This is, as you say, exactly a unilateral measure. We've been condemned actually on this policy year after year at the United Nations by practically the entire world community. If the goal is to get rid of communism in Cuba which I think is a worthy goal, seems to me, the thing we should do is just open up Cuba. I think the--the
quickest thing to undermine communism will be to open up trade and the--allow Americans and Cubans…

Peter Robinson: Well let me push back…

David Cortright: …to interact normally.

Peter Robinson: Let me push back a little bit. As we said, Cuba trades freely with every other country except Israel. So the United States doesn't trade with Cu--Cuba and Israel doesn't trade with Cuba. So what the Cuban people need, they can get from other countries. They're free to engage in trade. The real reason why Cubans are suffering is because of communism. And under communism they can--they don't produce goods that anybody particularly wants to--the point is that the United States is not actually lowering the standard of living in Cuba. It's using this sanction to make a statement. And it is a worthy and true statement which is that Fidel Castro is a stinker. So it--to that extent, would you go fo--with the sanctions?

David Cortright: But I think…

Peter Robinson: Or should they simply be lifted?

David Cortright: I think they still should be lifted and--and even it's true that Cuba can trade with the rest of the world but their giant neighbor with whom they traded previously overwhelmingly they cannot trade with. And there are huge costs to Cuba from having this continuing American embargo. And we should just lift it entirely and allow the trade to flow freely. I think it would open up Cuban society.

Peter Robinson: We know that one asset Cuba has is beaches. We also know that there are Americans who'd love to go to those beaches no farther than about seventy miles away. So that is, in fact, lowering the standard of living in Cuba.

David Cortright: I think so.

[Talking at same time]

Peter Robinson: Just drop the sanctions against…

Michael Nacht: Well and there's no sense of--of any repercussions, of any threats. You know, I mean, it's not analogous see.

Peter Robinson: The whole policy's become very weary.

Michael Nacht: But--but, on the other hand, you have a more powerful domestic constituency in support of sanctions against Cuba than you do of support against--of sanctions against any other country in the world. And that largely explains the…
Peter Robinson: Do the sanctions against Cuba matter to Cubans?

Richard Becker: Oh they matter a great deal. The people have suffered a lot because of the sanctions there. And it's not just a one way sanction, by the way, it's not just unilateral. In every U.S. Embassy in the world, there's an official who is responsible for trying to discourage trade between that country and its companies and Cuba. And in the countries where United States economic influence is very strong, they succeed all the time in doing this. That's why the Cubans don't call it embargo, they call it a blockade.

Peter Robinson: Name a few countries that…

Richard Becker: Mexico…

Peter Robinson: We actually do succeed in preventing Mexicans from trading with Cuba?

Richard Becker: Oh yes, yes. We have many examples of this, of--of preventing the carrying out of economic activity. But I think that…

Peter Robinson: So you agree it's a mistake. Just drop it.

Richard Becker: Oh it should have been dropped a long…


Title: Tough Love

Peter Robinson: Can we be effective in putting pressure on governments while permitting the citizens of a nation to lead more or less normal lives? Is there a way to do that? Should Colin Powell accept that as a guiding principle of--of designing sanctions or is it simply impractical?

Michael Nacht: I--I think it's a matter of degree. I think it's tough. There are targeted sanctions which are more, you know, are more easily felt by the leadership than the populous. But inev--inevitably, it's hard to do one without the other.

Peter Robinson: So however, you would impose that burden on Colin Powell? Do your best…

Michael Nacht: Sure, of course.

Peter Robinson: …to design these sanctions so that they…
Michael Nacht: To the extent--to the extent that you can just hurt the ones you want to hurt and not hurt the ones you don't want to hurt, of course, you want to do that…

Peter Robinson: Okay but you also want to issue a warning to David that it's going to be messy and so don't expect too much.

Michael Nacht: And there are also sometimes when, you know, it's sad to say, you do want to hurt the general populous if that will lead to opposition which will overthrow the bad guy who otherwise you can't get out. I mean, would you say during World War II that let's not impose sanctions against Hitler because of all the terrible things that are happening to the German people. Horrible things happened to the German people. You know what, but we were at war with them. And you know what the result was? The result was that the bad guy finally was defeated and sometimes it takes very brutal policies to get the bad guys out. They're not going to just stroll out because, you know, you don't like what they're doing.

David Cortright: On the question of targeted sanctions, there have been tremendous progress in the last few years especially through the United Nations' system. The Swiss government has convened a number of expert seminars on the means of more precisely targeting financial measures in order to get the money of the rulers and try not to hurt the civilian economy. It's never perfect. It's not exact but there are ways to do that. The German government has--has convened a series of meetings on more effective enforcement of arms embargoes which I think particularly should be looked at as a potentially very useful tool of international policy, travel bans and these other kinds of measures. Recently the UN is moving on diamond embargoes in terms of a very focused kind of way of cutting off the funding for these civil conflicts, these terrible civil conflicts in Africa. So there are ways in which we can target sanctions. It's never perfect. There are going to be side effects that are going to hurt the general population but a more targeted effort is possible and necessary. And I think it's very likely…

Peter Robinson: But you wish to impose a heavy burden on Colin Powell, you wish to stiffen his spine when he goes to congress. Don't just impose these sanctions willy nilly and don't impose blockades. Let us work extremely hard to target them.

David Cortright: Absolutely.

Peter Robinson: And you'd thing that's just impractical?

Richard Becker: Well I think Colin Powell has always--already in retreat on his policy from the time that he went to the Middle East. Two weeks later when he testified before the House International Relations Committee, he was instead enunciating an expanded list of military targets for Iraq and saying we are not easing up on sanctions. We intend to tighten the sanctions, in fact. And I think that there's a--if we really look at the policy, we
can see that today we have the Gulf region occupied by the U.S. military and they intend to stay there.

Peter Robinson: Michael, should the United States dispense with the notion of unilateral sanctions? Did sanctions fail in Cuba and succeed in Yugoslavia because in Yugoslavia we were not alone?

Michael Nacht: Well, I mean, to the extent that we can have multi-lateral sanctions endorsed by the United Nations, of course, the better.

[Talking at same time]

Michael Nacht: But there are times when the United States, look, the United States is a sovereign country too. If we don't want to trade with countries, if we want to actually use military clout to impede flow of goods, we can do it. We have that right to make those policies as well. They're not going to be often very effective but sometimes, as you said earlier about the symbolic…

[Talking at same time]

Peter Robinson: Can I just issue you…

[Talking at same time]

David Nacht: There are fifty-seven conflicts going on. War has gone on since the start of human history. It's going to go on through the end of human history.

Richard Becker: Let's just be that a--a blockade enforced by military means is an act of war…

[Talking at same time]

Peter Robinson: …always seek multi-lateral action.

David Cortright: I would say but sometimes the unilateral measures can be effective.

Peter Robinson: How?

David Cortright: Under President Carter--President Carter used the cut-off of military aid to a number of Latin American governments which helped encourage the process of democratization, undermine some of these military dictatorships and helped advanced…

Peter Robinson: And it worked…

David Cortright: …human rights in Latin America. So sometimes cutting off of targeted aid like military aid can be a way of sanctioning and moving toward human rights.
**Peter Robinson:** We've got to close it out. It's television. Let me--let me ask you to close with a prediction. I'll set it up. On the one hand, with Richard's notable exception, dissent, the two of you agree that the sanctions worked more or less in Yugoslavia. And everybody agrees they've been a failure in Cuba. So on that scale, Yugoslavia successful. Cuba, failure. A decade from now, how will we see our sanctions against Iraq? A Yugoslavia-like success or a Cuba-like failure? Richard?

**Richard Becker:** A disaster. A fail--a--a--a failure in terms of meeting any kind of humane ends but I--I am fearful that they combined with new military action is leading us into a new war against Iraq, a much wider war.

**Peter Robinson:** David?

**David Cortright:** I think it's probably going to be re--recorded as a failure certainly on a humanitarian level and policy-wise. There's not been any real measurable impact.

**Peter Robinson:** Michael?

**Michael Nacht:** Failure on a humanitarian level but hopefully successful in removing Saddam Hussein.

**Peter Robinson:** Gentlemen, thank you.

**Peter Robinson:** When the colonists imposed an embargo against British tea back in 1773, who outside the American colonies really cared? There were fewer than five million Americans in the entire continent. Today however, the United States is the world's only super power and although as our guests suggested, measuring the effects of our embargoes or calibrating the correct way to impose them may be as difficult as reading tea leaves. It's important for Colin Powell to try. I'm Peter Robinson. Thanks for joining us.