



A Critical Analysis of the Aggression by the United States and Israel against the Islamic Republic of Iran in Light of Ayatollah Khamenei's thought to Domination

Seyedeh Latifeh Hosseini: Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Faculty of Social Sciences and Economics, Alzahra University, Tehran, Iran (Corresponding Author).

L.hosseini@Alzahra.ac.ir

Alireza Koohkan: Associate Professor, Department of International Relations, Faculty of Law and political Sciences, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

koohkan@atu.ac.ir

Abstract: The military attacks by the Zionist regime and the United States of America against the Islamic Republic of Iran not only constitute a clear violation of the principle of the prohibition of the use of force and an aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent state, but also reveal a tangible manifestation of the discriminatory and hegemonic functions of international structures, especially the United Nations Security Council. This article, using a descriptive-analytical method and a legal-critical approach, and relying on authoritative sources of international law as well as the official statements and positions of the Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, examines the Security Council's ineffectiveness in two essential areas: the determination and declaration of aggression, and the fulfillment of its duty to maintain international peace and security. The findings demonstrate that the Council's performance, due to the domination of great powers and the veto mechanism, has not only failed to achieve justice and ensure collective security, but has also become an instrument for entrenching domination and perpetuating the impunity of aggressors.

Keywords: Ayatollah Khamenei, Islamic Republic of Iran, aggression, domination, Security Council.

Introduction

In the early morning of June 13, 2025, the Zionist regime of Israel carried out a series of premeditated attacks against the Islamic Republic of Iran. These actions, which included attacks on residential areas, peaceful nuclear facilities, civilians including women and children, and the assassination of military commanders and scientists, not only constituted a clear violation of the national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran under the United Nations Charter but also represent a clear instance of military aggression in the classical sense of international law. In the contemporary international legal system, the principle of the prohibition of the use of force, the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs, and the principle of respect for the territorial integrity of states are considered peremptory norms (*jus cogens*). However, the reality of international politics demonstrates that these principles are sometimes disregarded in the face of the will and interests of great powers, particularly the United States and its allies such as Israel.

The Security Council, designed based on post-World War II power structures, possesses an unjust structure featuring the veto power of its five permanent members. The Zionist regime, backed by the United States, has consistently been immune from the consequences of its aggressive acts due to the U.S. veto in the Security Council, indicating the Council's biased actions. This article, employing a descriptive-analytical method with a legal and critical approach, drawing upon authoritative sources of international law and the official statements and positions of the Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, analyzes the inefficacy of the Security Council in two fundamental areas: the determination and declaration of aggression, and the fulfillment of its duty to maintain international peace and security. It seeks to answer the question of how the Security Council has proven ineffective regarding Israel's recent aggression against Iran in terms of determining and declaring aggression and ensuring international peace and security, and has become a tool serving the perpetuation of domination in the world. This article is predicated on the assumption that the Security Council, due to its power-oriented structure, was not only incapable of preventing aggression against Iran

but, through its silence and failure to issue a resolution declaring aggression by the Zionist regime, effectively conveys the impression that it acts in service of the domination of the United States and Israel in the international community.

In this context, while addressing the approach of Ayatollah Khamenei towards domination and the position of the Islamic Republic of Iran against it, the manner in which the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran have been violated within the framework of the United Nations Charter will be examined. Subsequently, the inefficacy of the Security Council will be identified in two areas: the determination and declaration of aggression by Israel and the United States against the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Council's failure to maintain international peace and security within the scope of its duties under the United Nations Charter. Finally, the conclusion will be presented.

1. The Islamic Republic of Iran is the embodiment of resistance against Western domination in the approach of Ayatollah Khamenei

Iran, as a country with a history of resistance against colonialism and foreign intervention, has adopted a firm stance against any form of political and legal domination. Emphasizing the principles of sovereignty and international justice, Iran does not recognize the system of domination and continues its legal and political resistance. In the approach of Grand Ayatollah Khamenei, the system of domination means the system of tyrants that has divided the world into two parts: the dominators and the dominated. This system of domination is fundamentally anti-freedom and anti-justice. It is anti-justice because in these dominant systems, such as America and Europe, despite their wealth, their people do not enjoy well-being, and the major portion of these countries' wealth belongs to a very limited few, and they also commit injustices against the peoples of other countries. In his view, the system of domination is an anti-freedom system. This is because the most important type of freedom for nations is the public freedom of the country, meaning independence. Independence means the freedom of a nation to freely conduct its own affairs, and the system of domination is contrary to this freedom (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with Basij

members, November 30, 2019). According to Ayatollah Khamenei, the current world order is changing, and the thought of resistance and the resistance front against the dominating approach of the West is one of the signs of this change. In his view, the dominating approach and the division of the world into dominator and dominated systems are products of the Industrial Revolution in the West, which has continued for several centuries. However, in today's world, thanks to the initiative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the thought of resistance against domination is expanding (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with students, February 1, 2023). According to Ayatollah Khamenei, the hostile actions of America as a system of domination stem from its inability and impotence in the face of the anti-arrogant power of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the international stage. At one time, it encouraged the Ba'athist regime of Iraq to aggress against Iran (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with participants in the 7th conference of the Global Ahl al-Bayt Assembly, September 3, 2022), and today it supports the fake regime of Israel in its aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Ayatollah Khamenei believes that the Islamic Republic of Iran is the standard-bearer of justice and spirituality against a world of force whose thought is based on materialism—that is, precisely the opposite of justice and the opposite of spirituality; by this reasoning, the opposition and confrontation of the arrogant world and the system of domination with the movement of the Islamic Republic of Iran is considered natural, with America at the forefront of the system of domination. From his perspective, the line separating the realization of Islam and the Islamic system and the political embodiment of Islam from the system of domination headed by America is the only line that must be highlighted (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with participants in the 7th conference of the Global Ahl al-Bayt Assembly, September 3, 2022). Ayatollah Khamenei explains that religious or Islamic democracy is a new idea that the Islamic Republic of Iran has introduced to the international community. This very movement of the Islamic Republic of Iran has been able to disrupt the predetermined framework of the system of domination (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a

meeting with members of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, May 25, 2022). Ayatollah Khamenei believes that the formation of an Islamic society, the establishment of social justice, independence, and freedom are the fundamental ideals of the Islamic Republic of Iran (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a video connection with representatives of student organizations, May 11, 2021). This means that the Islamic Republic of Iran is not willing to become a partner of the global system of domination nor to accompany the system of domination in domination or submissiveness. The Islamic Republic system opposes oppression and domination (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a video connection with the people of East Azerbaijan Province, February 17, 2021). According to Ayatollah Khamenei, throughout the life of the Islamic Republic of Iran, from the victory of the Revolution until now, America has refrained from no action against the Islamic Republic of Iran – the most severe of which has been the military attack on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran alongside the Zionist regime. Thus, in his intellectual system, the word "resistance" takes on meaning in this context: the resistance forces, the resistance movement, or the resistance front signify a truth called Islam that has risen up in the contemporary era (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with Basij members, November 30, 2019). In Ayatollah Khamenei's view, "Death to America" means death to domination, death to aggression, death to encroaching upon the rights of nations (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with the people of East Azerbaijan Province, February 18, 2019). Accordingly, the new dynamism of the Islamic awakening movement based on the model of resistance against American and Zionist domination, the failure of American policies in the West Asia region, the expansion of the Islamic Republic's powerful political presence in West Asia, and its wide reflection throughout the world of domination are among the phenomena that the global stage witnesses today (Ayatollah Khamenei, Second Step of the Revolution statement addressed to the Iranian nation, February 11, 2019). In his view, the system of domination, with America at its head, has sought to deprive Iran of security since the very first day of the Islamic Revolution's victory (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during the

graduation ceremony of students at the Police University, September 17, 2017). A clear example of this issue is the recent aggressive actions of the system of domination: the aggression of the Zionist regime and America against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran. In Ayatollah Khamenei's intellectual system, the foreign policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran is non-submission to the system of domination, and although this path has incurred costs, the Islamic Republic system has progressed and made its slogans more prominent (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during the endorsement ceremony for the 12th term of the Presidency of the Islamic Republic of Iran, August 3, 2017). The negation of the system of domination is, in his view, one of the key concepts that requires proper explanation. This is because one of the consequences of the system of domination is that countries with initiative, progress, and self-confidence transfer their habits, customs, and worldview – through books, research, and other means – to dominated countries and plan for the continuation of domination. In his view, the front opposing the Islamic Republic of Iran, referred to with terms such as the system of domination or global Zionism, is a malicious and deceitful front with oppressive thoughts that is hostile to the core religious beliefs, independence, and refusal to submit to bullying of the Iranian nation (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with commanders of the Army's Khatam al-Anbiya Air Defense Base and the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, May 27, 2016). Ayatollah Khamenei considers one of America's goals in the West Asia region to be strengthening the arrogant base of the Zionist regime. He believes that the Islamic Revolution or revolutionary Islam has prevented the realization of this goal, and the Islamic nature of the system has caused the Islamic Republic of Iran not to fall under the umbrella of the system of domination and the arrogant power of America or others (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with Friday prayer leaders of Tehran province mosques, August 21, 2016). In Ayatollah Khamenei's view, all domineering countries are united in the principle of bullying the people, weak nations, weak governments, various global communities, plundering their financial and economic resources, and increasingly accumulating power for themselves (Ayatollah

Khamenei, statements during a meeting with Friday prayer leaders of Tehran province mosques, August 21, 2016). Ayatollah Khamenei believes that the international system of domination, of which America is the embodiment today, consists of the major Zionist capitalists and certain other arrogant governments (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with teachers and educators, May 2, 2016). Thus, in his view, the system of domination means that international system based on dividing the world into dominator and dominated (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with commanders and personnel of the Army Air Force, February 8, 2014), and the nature and innate behavior of the United States government is interventionist and domineering (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with commanders and personnel of the Army Air Force, February 8, 2014). Consequently, in Ayatollah Khamenei's intellectual system, the world wars in this recent period, over the last two or three centuries, have been largely influenced by the system of domination, meaning that either they themselves were at war with a country, or they caused two other groups to go to war for their own benefit and gain (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with commanders of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, September 17, 2013). The recent aggressions by America and Israel against the Islamic Republic of Iran also stem from this domineering perspective that, according to Grand Ayatollah Khamenei, exists in the world. The approach of Ayatollah Khamenei provides a theoretical framework that can serve as the basis for a critical analysis of the Security Council's performance in response to the aggressions of America and Israel against the sovereignty of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

2. The violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran within the framework of the United Nations Charter

The Equality of State Sovereignty and Respect for the Territorial Integrity of Independent States are among the important principles of international law explicitly stipulated in the United Nations Charter as the founding document of the organization. Violation of these important principles will lead to the threat and breach of international peace and security. However, since the determination of situations that

threaten international peace and security falls within the purview of the Security Council, when this global body does not consider a situation such as the blatant aggression of the Zionist regime against Iran as a threat to world peace, the question arises that such an institution suffers from structural weakness (Akindele, 1976: 102-3). The inability of the United Nations to find solutions for all global conflicts, including the aggressions of the United States and Israel against the sovereignty of the Islamic Republic of Iran, has led this organization to act selectively in its practice in response to crises arising in the international community. Kofi Annan, the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, was more candid about the selective response of the UN, stating: "We all know what happened after the tragedy in Somalia. We know that the international community and Western countries were not ready to deploy to Rwanda, and after Sierra Leone, I think there is little incentive for any Western country to intervene in African operations" (Ademola, 2005:177). Consequently, the passive stance of the United Nations, especially the Security Council, will cause distrust among the independent member states of the international community (Ademola, 2005: 178). According to Ayatollah Khamenei, the Security Council has either remained silent in the face of global criminal events or has not adopted an effective and just response.

The principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity constitute two fundamental pillars of the international legal order. Based on the Westphalian system of 1648, each state has complete and independent sovereignty over its territory, and others have no right to interfere in its internal affairs. Sovereignty means supreme legal authority within a defined territory, and territorial integrity means the inviolable protection of a country's physical territory. These principles, in addition to being rooted in customary law, are also recognized in the United Nations Charter pursuant to paragraph 2 of Article 1 of the Charter in the form of the principle of sovereign equality, and in paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter in the form of respect for the territorial integrity of states (United Nations Charter, 1945: Arts 1 & 2). However, in the aggressions of Israel and the United States against the Islamic Republic of Iran, not only was the independent sovereignty of

the Islamic Republic of Iran and the territorial and airspace of the Islamic Republic of Iran violated, but simultaneously, this aggressive act, contrary to the rules of international law, also constitutes an outright intervention in the internal affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the external independence of this system. One of the overarching goals of the Charter is the maintenance of "international peace and security" and "respect for the right to sovereignty and territorial integrity" of states. Pursuant to paragraph 7 of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter, intervention in the internal affairs of states is prohibited. The principle of non-intervention and the principle of the prohibition of the use of force are the legal bases for prohibiting the aggression of Israel and the United States against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The principles of good neighborly relations of the UN emphasize that "any action aimed at the disruption or impairment of the unity and territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes of the Charter" (Friendly Relations Declaration, 1970: XXV.). In the intellectual system of Ayatollah Khamenei, the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent countries of the world must be recognized by all member states of the international community as well as international institutions, and that a superpower such as the United States speaking of the submission of an independent, sovereign state like Iran indicates a clear violation of these principles in international law, and it has become clear that the main goal of this system of domination has been the submission of Iran (Ayatollah Khamenei, third televised message addressed to the Iranian nation following the aggression of the Zionist regime, June 26, 2025).

3. The inefficacy of the Security Council in determining and declaring Israel's aggression against Iran

The Security Council is the primary body for maintaining international peace and security, and according to the United Nations Charter, it is tasked with examining any aggression against the territorial integrity of states and taking necessary measures (UN Charter, 1945: Arts. 24, 39). However, in the blatant aggression of June 13, 2025 against Iran, this body proved practically ineffective due to its political structure and the veto power of its five permanent members. This silence and

lack of effective action by the Security Council not only created a supervisory vacuum but also effectively granted informal legitimacy to Israel's aggression.

In international law, aggression is recognized as the most serious form of the illegal use of force against other states, targeting the very foundation of state sovereignty and the international order. This concept has been shaped within the framework of the prohibition of the use of force under Article 2(4) of the UN Charter and, based on historical experiences such as the Nuremberg Trials, as "crimes against peace," which was manifested against the Islamic Republic through the aggressions of the US and Israel. Paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the UN Charter explicitly prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, or other aspects of states (United Nations Charter, 1945). This article, which embodies the peremptory norm (*jus cogens*) of the prohibition of the use of force, is also known as the core of the law relating to aggression. According to the provisions of Article 3 of General Assembly Resolution No. 3314 of 1974 on the Definition of Aggression, instances of aggression include military invasion, bombardment, blockade of ports, attack on military forces, and support for non-state armed groups and mercenaries (United Nations General Assembly, Definition of Aggression, 1974). The 1974 Definition of Aggression Resolution is among those resolutions whose content, due to its generality, is considered part of customary international law. According to the General Assembly's Definition of Aggression Resolution, Israel and the United States must be considered aggressors. Pursuant to Article 39 of the UN Charter, the determination of an act of aggression is among the duties of the Security Council, and under this article, it is the Security Council that must determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and, under Chapter VII of the Charter, take appropriate measures to maintain or restore international peace (United Nations Charter, 1945: art 2 and Chapter VII). Although the International Criminal Court has jurisdiction over the crime of aggression, the exercise of this jurisdiction, due to its complementary nature, is subject to referral by the Security Council and the Security Council's decision determining aggression. Thus, the Security Council

plays a decisive role within the framework of international law in triggering the International Criminal Court's jurisdiction over the crime of aggression (Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as amended in 2010). Regarding the referral of the act of aggression against the Islamic Republic of Iran to the International Criminal Court, although it could have taken appropriate action based on its legal duties, it has taken no action in this regard.

In the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals after World War II, certain state leaders were convicted of "crimes against peace," which were later considered analogous to the crime of aggression. This historical precedent formed the basis of the legal and criminological literature on aggression. In the 2005 case of the Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda, the customary nature of the definition of aggression under the General Assembly resolution was also emphasized (ICJ Reports, Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda, 2005: 168). Based on these precedents, it was expected that international bodies, particularly the Security Council, would take effective action to declare aggression against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Alongside the Security Council, the General Assembly, through instruments such as "Uniting for Peace," can play a substitute role in the absence of Council action (Falsafi, 1990: 35). It should be noted, however, that there are different approaches regarding collective security actions. One approach holds that collective security does not serve the interests of powerful states. Another view, however, considers collective security as a tool for powerful states to impose their interests on others. Therefore, in this view, the Security Council is the central organization and body that perpetuates Western imperialism (Frederking, 2007: 26-27). In practice, the Security Council acts only when the power possessing the veto privilege supports common interests through multilateral cooperation. In the event of conflicting interests and a veto by one of the permanent members, the Security Council is unable to exercise its function (A. Cassese, 1978: 15.). Consequently, the Security Council must observe the principles of justice and fairness when exercising its powers, because the member states of the United Nations have placed their security and survival in the hands of the 15 Council members (Ziaei Bigdeli, 2008: 5-8). This is

a heavy and serious responsibility borne by each member of the Security Council. Therefore, it is important that every Security Council decision be taken after careful consideration. This is possible only when the Security Council bases its decisions and actions on the Charter and other international treaties (Kirgis, 1995: 518). Perhaps if there had been effective judicial review of Security Council actions under Article 39, these concerns would have been alleviated (Kirgis, 1995: 506).

Following Israel's aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Ayatollah Khamenei, in his first message after the aggression, emphasized the defense by Iran's armed forces against foreign aggression until the aggressor is stopped (Ayatollah Khamenei, first televised message addressed to the Iranian nation following the Zionist regime's invasion of Iran, June 13, 2025). In Ayatollah Khamenei's view, Israel's aggression against Iran began while government officials of the Islamic Republic were engaged in indirect negotiations with the American side, and there was no issue from Iran indicating the existence of a military move or harsh action. Of course, it was discernible from the beginning that the United States was also involved in the aggression of the Zionist regime (Ayatollah Khamenei, second televised message addressed to the Iranian nation following the Zionist regime's invasion, June 18, 2025)—an assumption that was fully proven by direct US attacks on Iran. In the UN Charter, not only the use of force but also the threat of force is prohibited. In Ayatollah Khamenei's view, the bullying countries of the world, such as the United States, which possess permanent membership in the Security Council, use this global forum as a tool. The result is that not only does this Council not contribute to global security, but whenever concepts such as human rights or democracy and the like become a means for their greed and greater domination, they rush to their aid and cast a veil of deceit and lies over their illegitimate acts (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements at the Fourth Conference in Support of the Palestinian Nation, March 5, 2009). Ayatollah Khamenei believes that although the world's superpowers are not expected to be good or to refrain from oppression, global forums are expected to act fairly and independently. He states

that the United Nations, whose name means it belongs to nations, is in his view in the service of a few bullying and greedy governments of the world. This is to say that the Security Council, as the main decision-making body of the UN and the heart of the organization, has shown in various situations that in critical times it is entirely at the disposal of the superpowers and works for them, not for the nations. A case in point is the imposed war of Iraq against Iran, where instead of issuing a resolution that the aggressor, Iraq, should withdraw from Iranian territory, it issued a resolution calling for a ceasefire between Iran and Iraq (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during Eid al-Fitr sermon, March 14, 1993). A recent example is the aggression of Israel and the United States against Iran, all of which indicate the Security Council's lack of impartiality and its inefficacy in fulfilling its primary duty and in upholding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of independent states.

4. The inefficacy of the Security Council in maintaining international peace and security based on its duties under the United Nations Charter

The United Nations was established in 1945 with the primary goal of maintaining international peace and security. To this end, the UN Charter embedded a system for the peaceful settlement of disputes or the adjustment of disputes and situations, as well as the employment of collective measures in times of threat to or breach of the peace (Goodrich, 1955: 1-). Of course, the intention of the Charter's drafters was that the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, as well as overseeing actions related to the maintenance of international peace and security, would rest with the United Nations (Akindele, 1976: 132.).

Paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the UN Charter is the most important and fundamental provision and expresses the prohibition of the use of force in international law, whereby members of the United Nations are prohibited in their international relations from threatening or using force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. The International Court of Justice, in the case concerning Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against

Nicaragua, declared the prohibition of the use of force to be a peremptory norm (*jus cogens*) (Bianchi, 2009: 660-4.). However, under the current legal framework of the principle of non-use of force in the Charter, the scope of exceptions is limited to self-defense under Article 51 of the Charter, meaning that the use of force is contingent upon an armed attack and authorization by the Security Council (Momtaz, 2012: 175). The drafters of the UN Charter recognized the possibility of using force to prevent and remove threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression, but not for initial aggression (Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, 2004: Para. 183). Among the exceptions to the principle of non-use of force are the collective actions of the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter (Seifi, 1994: 239). The legal basis for the Security Council's role in enforcement actions is Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The special role of the permanent members of the Security Council is accompanied by the power to veto proposed actions of other Council members. Such a right reflects the logic of power (MacQueen, 2006: 46). The International Court of Justice considers the determination of an armed attack necessary for the use of force in self-defense, whereas the aggression by Israel and subsequently the United States against Iran was initial and armed, providing the Islamic Republic of Iran the possibility of self-defense against it (ICJ, Corfu Channel Case, 1949).

According to Ayatollah Khamenei, even before the United Nations Charter, which was created to achieve international peace and security, Islam had already set forth this goal. In his view, this ideal order stands in opposition to the system of domination, which in recent centuries, the domineering Western powers, and today the bullying and aggressive government of the United States, have claimed and promoted (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements at the 16th Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, August 30, 2012). He believes that the arrogant powers of the world have no limits; they want to dominate the entire world, all global financial resources, and all human forces (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements during a meeting with the people of Fars Province, April 23, 2011). According to Ayatollah Khamenei, the United Nations, under Article 1 of the Charter, is obligated to ensure justice in its specific form, namely confronting the

aggressor, and this is our demand from the world and the United Nations. In the past, during the imposed war of Iraq against Iran, the Security Council violated its primary duty of maintaining international peace and security. Similar to the recent aggression of Israel and the United States against Iran, this Council maintained a deadly silence for years during the Iran-Iraq war, until after the liberation of Khorramshahr it issued its second resolution in 1982, requesting a return to international borders. In that resolution, there was no mention of aggression, no naming of the aggressor, no reference to damages, no remedy for compensating them, no guarantee for genuine security and stability, and no punishment for the one responsible for insecurity (Ayatollah Khamenei, statements before the UN General Assembly, 1987). History repeated itself, and this time too, the Security Council took no action to declare aggression or name the aggressor, this time because one of its permanent members was among the recent aggressors against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Once again, the Security Council proved that its decisions are influenced by the interests of the system of domination and the powerful actors in the world.

Thus, although under the UN Charter the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security rests with the Security Council, in practice, the Security Council from 1945 to the present has followed a declining trajectory in ensuring and guaranteeing international peace and security. The longer it has been since its establishment, the more it has come under the influence of the will and interests of the powers possessing the veto, such as the United States.

Conclusion


The aggression of the Zionist regime against the national sovereignty of the Islamic Republic, the assassination of senior military commanders outside battlefields, the killing of civilians including women, men, and children, attacks on civilian targets including relief centers, healthcare facilities, residential homes, and attacks on peaceful nuclear facilities occurred at a time when, according to paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the United Nations Charter as the founding document of the UN, the threat of force is prohibited, let alone the use of force

against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of states. The United Nations, which under paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Charter is supposed to be a center for coordinating the realization of its goals, stands idly by watching the aggressive actions of a regime whose existence as an independent state based on the constitutive elements of statehood and under the rules and regulations of international law is seriously questionable. Recent developments in international relations and the hostile actions of the United States and the Zionist regime against the Islamic Republic of Iran have once again revealed the deep gap between the fundamental principles of international law and the political realities governing international institutions.

The Security Council, as the main organ of the United Nations and its executive arm responsible for maintaining international peace and security, lacks efficacy in serving the non-peaceful desires of the United States as a permanent member with veto power. Through its passive and selective stances outside its primary duties, this Council has once again demonstrated in Israel's aggression – this time against Iran – that it is incapable of enforcing the principle of the prohibition of the use of force, for the sake of whose guarantee the United Nations was established after World War II. According to the definition of aggression in General Assembly Resolution 3314 (1974), the military bombardment of another country's facilities without valid justification is a clear instance of aggression. Israel's recent aggression, aimed at weakening Iran's defense and scientific pillars and documented as an operational act – namely, a "violent military action" against another country – is thereby considered defined aggression. Bodies such as the International Commission of Jurists and UN human rights expert groups have also, in their analytical reports, deemed Israel's attack as aggression and explicitly stated: "Nothing under international law can justify these attacks, particularly the targeting of civilians or nuclear facilities." The findings of this research, based on legal and critical analysis, indicate that the aforementioned military attacks not only constitute a clear violation of the principle of the prohibition of the use of force and aggression against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran as an independent state, but also clearly demonstrate that the current international system, particularly within the framework of the

Security Council, operates under the influence of great power interests and is incapable of fulfilling its inherent duty to ensure international peace and security.

The intellectual framework of Ayatollah Khamenei, emphasizing the rejection of any form of subjugation and dependence, presents the Islamic Republic of Iran as a model for active resistance against the Western hegemonic structure. In this approach, domination is not merely an abstract political concept but a structural and organized reality in international relations, exercised through institutions such as the Security Council. Respect for the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Iran is not only a political demand but a binding legal obligation for all states, the violation of which constitutes a serious breach of international law. The mechanism for determining aggression in the Security Council is political and influenced by the interests of its permanent members, to the extent that justice and truth are sacrificed to power-oriented expediencies.



References

- A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility, (2004), Report of the High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, United Nation", Para. 183. At: [http://www. UN.org/Secure World / Report 2. Pdf](http://www.UN.org/Secure World / Report 2. Pdf).
- A. Cassese, (1978), United Nations Peace-Keeping, Legal Essays, Sijthoff and Noordhoff.
- Abass, Ademola, (2004), Regional Organizations and the Development of Collective Security beyond Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, Hart Publishing.
- Akindele R.A, (1976), the Organization and Promotion World Peace: a Study of Universal – Regional Relationships, University of the Toronto Press.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (1987) Statements before the UN General Assembly, 1987.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (1993) Statements during Eid al-Fitr sermons, March 14, 1993.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2009) Statements at the Fourth Conference in Support of the Palestinian Nation, March 5, 2009.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2009) Statements during a meeting with students, pupils, and families of martyrs, November 3, 2009.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2011) Statements during a meeting with the people of Fars Province, April 23, 2011.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2011) Statements during a meeting with the people and workers of the Asaluyeh oil industry, March 28, 2011.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2012) Statements at the 16th Summit of the Non-Aligned Movement, August 30, 2012.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2012) Statements during a meeting with Ban Ki-moon, Secretary-General of the United Nations, August 29, 2012.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2012) Statements during a meeting with state officials and ambassadors of Islamic countries, August 19, 2012.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2013) Statements during a meeting with commanders of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, September 17, 2013.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2014) Statements during a meeting with commanders and personnel of the Army Air Force, February 8, 2014.

- Ayatollah Khamenei (2016) Statements during a meeting of commanders of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps with the Leader of the Revolution, September 18, 2016.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2016) Statements during a meeting with commanders of the Army's Khatam al-Anbiya Air Defense Base and the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces, May 27, 2016.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2016) Statements during a meeting with Friday prayer leaders of Tehran province mosques, August 21, 2016.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2016) Statements during a meeting with teachers and educators, May 2, 2016.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2017) Statements during a meeting with a group of students, June 7, 2017.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2017) Statements during the graduation ceremony of students at the Police University, September 17, 2017.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2018) Statements during a meeting with members of the Assembly of Experts, September 6, 2018.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2019) Second Step of the Revolution statement addressed to the Iranian nation, February 11, 2019.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2019) Statements during a meeting with Basij members, November 30, 2019.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2019) Statements during a meeting with the people of East Azerbaijan Province, February 18, 2019.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2021) Statements during a video connection with representatives of student organizations, May 11, 2021.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2021) Statements during a video connection with the people of East Azerbaijan Province, February 17, 2021.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2022) Statements during a meeting with elites and top academic talents, October 19, 2022.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2022) Statements during a meeting with members of the Islamic Consultative Assembly, May 25, 2022.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2022) Statements during a meeting with participants in the 7th conference of the Global Ahl al-Bayt Assembly, September 3, 2022.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2022) Statements during a meeting with students, November 2, 2022.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2022) Statements during a meeting with veterans and commanders of the Sacred Defense, September 21, 2022.

- Ayatollah Khamenei (2024) Statements during a meeting with Hajj officials, May 6, 2024.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2025) First televised message addressed to the Iranian nation following the Zionist regime's invasion of Iran, June 13, 2025.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2025) Second televised message addressed to the Iranian nation following the Zionist regime's invasion, June 18, 2025.
- Ayatollah Khamenei (2025) Third televised message addressed to the Iranian nation following the aggression of the Zionist regime, June 26, 2025.
- Ayatollah Khamenei, Statements during the endorsement ceremony for the 12th term of the Presidency of the Islamic Republic of Iran, August 3, 2017.
- Bianchi, Andrea, (2009), "the International Regulation of the Use of Force: The Politics of Interpretive Method", Leiden Journal of International Law, Vol.22, No.4.
- Charter of the United Nations, (1945).San Francisco, 26 June 1945.Available at: <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter>.
- Falsafi, Hedayatollah, (1990), "The Security Council and World Peace," Legal Research Journal, No. 8, Autumn and Winter.
- Frederking, Brian, (2007), The United States and Security Council: Collective Security since the Cold War, Routledge Taylor and Francis Group, London and New York.
- Friendly Relations Declaration, (1970), UN General Assembly, Resolution 2625 (XXV).
- Goodrich, Leland M and Simons, Anne P, (1955), The United Nations and The Maintenance of International Peace and Security, The Brookings International, Washington, D.C.
- International Court of Justice ,(2005),Armed Activities on the Territory of the Congo (Democratic Republic of the Congo v. Uganda), Judgment of 19 December 2005, ICJ Reports Available at: <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/116>.
- International Court of Justice, (1949), Corfu Channel Case, Judgment 1949 (sovereignty and unlawful use of force).
- International Court of Justice. (1986), Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America),

Merits, Judgment of 27 June 1986, ICJ Reports 1986, p. 14. Available at: <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/70>.

International Criminal Court. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, as amended in 2010 (Kampala Amendments). International Criminal Court, The Hague, 2010. Available at: https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/Publications/Compendium/Compendium.3rd.26.ENG.pdf.

Kirgis Jr, Fredric L, (1995), "The Security Council's First Fifty Years", American Journal of International Law, Vol.89, No.3.

MacQueen, Norrie, (2006), Peace Keeping and the International System, Routledge, London and New York.

Momtaz, Jamshid and Saberi Ansari, Behzad, (2012), "The Impact of Subsequent State Practice on the Principle of 'Prohibition of the Threat or Use of Force'", Strategy Quarterly, No. 63, Year 21, Summer, pp. 175-204.

Seifi, Seyed Jamal, (1994-1995), "The Evolution of the Concept of State Sovereignty in Light of the Principle of Self-Determination of Nations," Legal Research Journal, No. 15, pp. 239-265.

United Nations General Assembly. (1974), Definition of Aggression, Resolution 3314 (XXIX), 14 December Available at: <https://legal.un.org/avl/ha/da/da.html>.

Ziaei Bigdeli, Mohammad Reza et al., (2008), Advisory Opinions of the International Court of Justice (1948-1986), Allameh Tabatabaei University Press, First Edition, Volume One.

پژوهشگاه علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی



پروہشگاہ علوم انسانی و مطالعات فرهنگی
پرتال جامع علوم انسانی