



Report of the Meeting

Iran-Israel Military Conflict in the Light of International Security Law (*droit international de la sécurité*)

6 May 2024



Lecturers

Dr. Nasrin Mosaffa,
Professor,
University of Tehran
IAUNS Chair

Dr. Mohammad Reza Ziai- Bigdeli,
Emeritus Professor,
Allameh Tabatabaei University
Meeting's Chairperson

Lectures' Kernels

- The IAUNS enjoys greeting esteemed guests and participants. It is an honor to extend a warm welcome to each and every one of you. Your great presence here today adds immense value to this gathering, and I look forward to the discussions and interactions that lie ahead.
- It's a pleasure to see so many bright faces ready to embark on another day of learning and growth. Welcome to another exciting opportunity to expand your knowledge and push your boundaries. Let's make the most of this time together and fuel our curiosity.
 - *International Security Law* being as a *postgraduate* major including vast subjects of security policy and law has been taught in many countries and hopefully will be probably established in Iran in the future;
 - Against previous military confrontations between Iran and Israel since the beginning of the Iran's revolution and its climax in 2006, recent Iran-Israel military conflicts has had three phases started by Israel's airstrike on the Iranian consulate complex in

Damascus, Syria on April 1 followed by Iran's operation against Israel designated as *Operation True Promise* on April 13 and Israel's small airstrikes on Iran's defensive airbases in Isfahan and Iraq and Syria on April 18;

- The first question of this questions and answers meeting is whether the recent military actions of Iran and Israel claims on the legitimate self-defense is acceptable according to international law?
- The second question following the negative answer to the first one is how can we describe Iran and Israel actions according to the international law?
- The third question is that whether the consulate immunity is affected by the fact that in the occasion of Israel's attack, there have been non- consular officers, settled in the consulate?
- Attack on a consulate and violation of state's sovereignty is not necessarily defined as an aggression and with this regard only Syria is allowed to self- defense according to international law.

Dr. Hasan Savari,

Associate Professor,
Tarbiat Modares University
Associate Professor,

- Self- defense as an exception to the Article 2 Par. 4 of the UN Charter is one of the use of force courses of action which is allowed by the international law and both Iran and Israel resorted to that to justify their actions. States that have fallen victim to armed attack are eligible to resorting to legitimate self-defense. What is essential in self-defense is states' procedures which are rule- making and are norms and criteria for lawfulness or unlawfulness of states' actions in accord with how they have been acting for so long.
- Interpretation of self-defense is essential to be restrictive, not extensive, and the UN Charter must be interpreted spiritually and not simply literally.
- 1961, 1963, 1973 conventions and also national sovereignty have been violated by Israel's airstrikes on Iranian consulate in Syria.
- Weak states should take action to promote international law since international security has been preferred by ICJ in addressing national security.

Dr. Mohsen Abdollahi,

Associate Professor,
Shahid Beheshti University

- Extensive interpretation of UN Charter should be refrained concerning the adaptability of Iran and Israel's claims on self-defense because it will put weaker states at a disadvantage. In accord with ICJ procedures in the case of Nicaragua and the definition of aggression in the General Assembly resolution 3314, Israel's airstrike on military members of the Iranian consulate can be counted as aggression against consulate's immunity and against sovereignty and therefore Iran's reaction as self-defense will be justified.
- Counter to Oil Platform case, pattern and gravity of Israel's military attacks leave Iran on the verge of continuous attacks which must be defended against and will not be violation of the use of force prohibition.
- UN Charter has been constantly weakening and states have been recurrently committed use of force and there have been many cases of gross and explicit violation of diplomatic and consular law as such which have been affected weak states most heavily.

Dr. Pouria Askari,

Associate Professor,
Allameh Tabatabaie University

- ✓ Having regard to the fact that there has been no ongoing armed conflict and active hostility between Iran and Israel any resort to self- defense by Israel is not justifiable because according to the ICJ in 1986 self-defense can be justified against actual and constant armed attack which does not seem rational. But the fact is that after 9/11 Israel has been routinely attacked Iran's positions which have regularly followed by Iran's letters to the Security Council.
- ✓ It is aggression if it is not defense and according to the General Assembly Resolution 3314 could be against more than territorial integrity and includes sovereignty.
- ✓ There won't be any change in the situation while an actual armed conflict has not been recognized but the fact of right to life violation is obvious regardless all of its probable legal attributions.

Questions and answers

Reporter: Dr. Setareh Taherkhani