

International Law, International Community

Sunday 31 December 2006, by [SAMAHA Joseph](#) (Date first published: 25 December 2006).

“The International Law” is on Iran’s side. “The International Community” is not. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) that Iran signed permits it to develop its peaceful nuclear program. However, there are those who deny that right. Despite the absence of any evidence; however simple, that Tehran has moved away from its “Civilian” nuclear program to a “Military” one. Neither the International Atomic Energy Agency, nor the various Foreign Intelligence Agencies working inside Iran, nor the Eastern and Eastern security services have any evidence that Iran is pursuing a nuclear weapons development program.

The accountability is therefore based on the intentions of the “Renegade Country!” and on violations it may have committed. The odd thing is that a report, recently issued by the US Senate Intelligence Committee, complains about the lack of such evidence considering it a factor that complicates the negotiations rather than a reason for de-escalation.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1737 was issued. And the confrontation has entered a new phase whose parameters will be defined by Iran’s response to it the steps it will adopt to counter it.

Not many weeks passed after North Korea declared itself a Military Nuclear State and conducted nuclear bomb tests before a new crisis erupted. What is remarkable is that the weeks separating the two events were marked by serious efforts to contain the North Korean action, remove it from serious debate and find ways to knock at the door of negotiations with North Korea.

It is possible to say, with out fear of getting it wrong, that the behavior towards Iran will cont copy that towards North Korea. Rigidity will replace flexibility. The main reason for that is the nature of the regional environment surrounding each of the two crises.

In the North Korean case, the United States was forced to delegate an effective role to the neighboring countries for two reasons: The first reason is that these countries, China, Japan, Russia and South Korea strongly defended the need for stability, de-escalation and a political solution. The second reason is that these countries do not represent for American interests, [as does the Middle East], lands that are wide open for looting, exploitation and acquiescence to relationships devoid of any proportionality.

This is not the case with Iran. Iran is surrounded by states that do not have sufficient national immunity. It is in direct proximity to the International Oil Reserves which is an American concern. In addition, it is in direct proximity to the Arab Israeli conflict which constitutes a priority, of special rank, for the United States.

The irony is, without underestimating Iran’s own significance, that the “Neighborhood” is providing Iran with its distinctiveness. The second irony is that the two American wars in Afghanistan and Iraq increased Iran’s regional influence as did the American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In all the above cases, Iran is filling the void caused by the Arab absence that is unprecedented in recent history. The “swelling” of the Iranian influence is primarily an Arab culpability. A culpability

exemplified by consigning the Arab security to outside forces, by the abstinence from a meaningful Iraqi policy that should have prevented the US invasion of Iraq and by the obvious failure of executing a strategy that makes Israel realize that the proposal of a total settlement is only one of several probable alternatives.

All that happened while Iran is a regional traditional power. What will happen when Iran becomes a regional super power as it stands at the intersection of the long term objectives that the US set for itself?

The adoption of resolution 1737 is the opening of a new stage of confrontation in the region. It should help the Americans calling for the use of international institutions and conditional dialog with Tehran. It could also help the opposite view that dialog is unfruitful and that the ceiling of working with others is too low to produce a solution for an urgent problem. It is probable that the group that lead the war with Iraq will push to enforce the second opinion and will do whatever they can to wage a new total confrontation in which "Nuclear Iran" will be the main title, the "Lebanese and Palestinian Terror" the second and the "Regional Polarization" its third.

We will find those who will establish tight linkage between resolution 1737 and resolutions 1559 and 1701. As well as between resolution 1737 and the decision to besiege the " Hamas " government and to "Isolate Syria"...This means the overall dangers for the region will increase, especially when we consider the obvious White House inclination to absorb the effects of the Baker-Hamilton Report.

It is not known whether 1737 will be the concluding event of 2006. But it is certain 2007 will be a year of confrontations centered on enforcing an arsenal of UN Security Council Resolutions adopted on behalf of International Interests and labeled as "International Legality Resolutions!"

P.S.

*Originally published in al- Akhbar daily newspaper, Beyrouth, Lebanon.