

Peace cannot be achieved through domination

Ebrahim Motaghi
Dean of Law, Political Science at
University of Tehran

Even though the ideal peace is a rare commodity in the Middle East, the reality is that more than any other region in the post-World War II era, the Middle East has been subject to crises and wars between social groups, states, and international actors. This posed a question to my mind: How could the Middle East of the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries (the pre-WW2 era) have been relatively at peace? To which I could only answer that it was partly because Israel had not

existed yet.

Israel and its establishment laid the groundwork for a rise in security conflicts in the region. The wars of 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973 as well as many more post-Soviet Union wars attest to that. When Israel, a proxy actor, gained too much military power and support, the United States failed to lay the necessary groundwork for peace in the region.

In the Middle East, peace is fragile and unstable. Some theorists pursue peace through international rights and law, while others pursue it through international institutions. However, in a

situation where Israel disregards UNSC resolutions such as resolution 248, it is only normal that peace cannot be made through international institutions. The third approach is peace-building through the US. Washington prescribes domination before making peace. The fourth approach is building peace through a balance of power, but in a region that has been dominated by Western powers for more than 500 years, it cannot be done. Iran's approach, by the way, is peace-building through resistance.

So, why are we where we are today? Because, for one thing, the

prevailing approach to peace is the one that says, "Peace is achieved once you establish dominance," and, for another thing, technology is changing the game constantly.

To those who consider Iran to be the destabilizing actor, I quote the political analyst Graham Fuller, who said the balanced power structure of the Middle East inevitably triggers new crises even if Iran had not existed. Every few years a new country wants to be the hegemon in the region. It's a war of everyone against everyone. Distrust breeds a vacuum of power, and in every vacuum, external powers look to intervene.



UN been reduced, at best, to ambulance

Christophe Peschoux
Former chief of Special Procedures
at OHCHR

I'm not speaking on behalf of the UN. I'm a lawyer but I say these as a human rights activist. So, don't expect diplomatic talk or niceties from me today as I intend to be honest.

One thing I learned when I worked in Cambodia, which is applicable everywhere, is that states respect human rights to the extent that they coincide with their interests. Thus, the use of double, multiple standards. And what is the consequence if a state fails to fulfill its responsibility? If it is powerful, there would be no consequences. Impunity prevails. If it is weak, it may be subject to pressure, interferences, sanctions, and military constraints. Two conflicts today lay bare the impotence of the United Nations: the war in Ukraine, and the genocide in Gaza. They have paralyzed the Security Council. As an international actor, the UN is now at a standstill. Besides its role to distill the ideology of the globalist doxa, the UN has been reduced, at best, to the role of

an ambulance, a humanitarian agency sent to the battlefields set alight by states, to pick up the pieces of what can still be saved. At worst, to a powerless spectator, wriggling its hands, and pronouncing more or less empty incantations, invoking state obligations, international law, human rights, and humanitarian principles. In 1991, the US had promised to president Gorbachev that NATO would not expand eastwards. However, NATO did not cease to close to the border of Russia, provoking it, and forcing it to either accept the threat of its military presence at its doorstep or to intervene militarily to stop that process. Russia repeatedly called for negotiations and exhausted diplomatic avenues in December 2021. The US ignored its requests. It refused to recognize its security interests and to enter a negotiation. In February, as the Ukrainian army was building up along its eastern border, Russia took the military initiative. Two months later, the war could have ended. A settlement was being negotiated in Turkey. But in April, Boris Johnson, on behalf of the West, went

to Kyiv and dissuaded Zelinsky from negotiating.

Russia, China, and other states that formed or joined the BRICS have observed attentively these developments with concern. They have understood that not only they are not welcomed in the "Western club," but that the so-called values that the West vocally professes are mere pretexts for pressuring them and advancing their interests.

Even more than the war in Ukraine, the genocide in Gaza has illustrated the Security Council's inability not only to ensure peace, which is its primary function, but even just a minimal protection of the civilian population.

In Gaza, Israel not only engaged in a deliberate policy of genocide but declared war on everyone trying to oppose or moderate it. Anyone observing that conflict for decades knows that Israel does not respect international law, human rights law, international humanitarian law, or the United Nations. It has ignored GA resolutions, Security Council resolutions, Human Rights Council resolutions, and International Court of Justice decisions. It only respects force and the only force that may curb and reign in its power hubris is the US, which supports it virtually unconditionally. It despises the United Nations which it has qualified as a "swamp of antisemitism".

How far Israel can go in ignominy? There seems to be no moral nor political limit to its actions. We knew that power corrupts morality, that absolute power corrupts absolutely, and that without checks and balances, power goes mad. Any other country in the world that would openly commit these blatant atrocities, for all to see, for more than a year, and boast of doing so in the name of its right to defend itself, and in the name of the good and civilization, would be sanctioned. And rightly so. There can be no place among civilized people for such behavior: it is the very opposite of civilization.



"In Gaza, Israel not only engaged in a deliberate policy of genocide but declared war on everyone trying to oppose or moderate it. Anyone observing that conflict for decades knows that Israel does not respect international law, human rights law, international humanitarian law, or the United Nations." — Christophe Peschoux

Path taken to make genocide tolerable

Zohreh Kharazmi
Scholar

A look at many Hebrew children's books that have been published in Israel shows plainly how they intend to distort history and make being part of a genocide tolerable for the next generation of Israelis. For example, in these books, it's common to come across fables where you can make a clear connection between the thoughtful humans in

the story and Israelis as well as between animals or Bedouins in the story and Palestinians. One story went even as far as to suggest that humans (Israelis) even brought their own stones to build new settlements but were nevertheless met with hostilities, implying that at that point, it's okay to feel frustrated and resort to violence.

All these dehumanizing techniques are arguably necessary for two reasons. Firstly, you have

to dehumanize your enemy and victimize your group to make resolute soldiers out of your children. Secondly, your children are bound to one day doubt the morality of their regime's actions (or face criticism from outside), and they have to know that the "animals" they are supposedly fighting are not worth defending.

Another similar common technique revolves around stripping Palestinians of their personhood. This is achieved mainly to make

everyone, including Palestinians themselves, believe that Palestinians are to blame for anything that happens to them. This technique has been so effective that I've been asked a lot, "Why did Hamas make that attack on October 7, 2023?" These questions could have easily been answered by the enquirers themselves if only they had known or considered every crime and injustice that Palestinians had been through prior to that point.

