US-led peace process 'aggravated' situation

Tamaki Tsukada Ambassador of Japan in Tehran

Currently, conflict is raging in the Middle East, and the prospect of permanent peace or sustainable development is very opaque, to say the least. However, I guess, it is the job of diplomats and diplomacy, for that matter, to work on the impossible and the imponderable.

The deteriorating situation between Israel and Palestine and the absence of the security architecture in the Middle East seem to be the two key fundamental factors to the region's instability. On the former question of the bilateral relationship between Israel and Palestine, there have been many attempts, but all have failed. The US-led peace process, which foregoes the resolution of the Israel-Palestinian conflict in favor of pursuing a partial economic and security integration in the region (the so-called Abraham Accords), has arguably aggravated the situation further.

On the question of the lack of a standing regional security architecture, existing organizations such as the GCC or the Arab League are exclusive by nature. For example, the GCC is purely a sub-regional organization that excludes Iran and Iraq, while the Arab League excludes non-Arab states by definition.

So, if these two issues (the bilateral relationship and the lack of a reasonable arrangement) remain unaddressed, the Middle East, in mind, will likely see insecurity reach new levels. Japan, on its part, will continue to contribute to easing the regional tensions and stabilizing the situation through diplomatic efforts, on the back of our traditional relations with all countries in the region and parties and on the strength of its fundamental security alliance with the United States, which gives Japan a special leverage to influence the United States.

Finally, this is not my government's position, but I would like to throw a small idea, a food for thought. I think that there is a need, or at least a need for a process, to develop a cooperative, inclusive regional security architecture for all states in the Middle East. The principles guiding the Middle East order should be the centrality of the states, non-interference in the internal affairs of others, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force, and, most importantly, regional ownership. In other words, the responsibility of maintaining regional security should fall on the shoulders of the countries in the region, rather than on the external powers. However, for resolving an existing regional conflict, I think there is value in bringing an external, faithful, and neutral third party to serve as a mediator to provide a platform to bring the conflicting parties together and ultimately lead to a solution for peace. But it would be unconstructive if external audiences intervened in the design or the maintenance of peace. The ultimate responsibility will reside in the region, and it should have ownership of whatever architecture or structure that was built there.



West Asia's Missing



By following the developments in West Asia (the Middle East) and more so living in them, one can't help but feel that peace is elusive in the region. The prescriptions can almost never be neatly applied here, and forcing peace always ends up a disaster. Far from being a monologue before throwing the metaphorical towel, this is a reminder that to achieve peace, those who wish it — which is obviously not everyone — have to work harder, together.

This is exactly why in this critical regional juncture, the Foundation of Dialogue and Solidarity of the United Nations (FODASUN) organized its sixth annual international conference on the topic of the future of peace and human rights in West Asia, featuring distinguished speakers from various domestic and international backgrounds. FODASUN is a non-governmental organization based in Iran, dedicated to promoting regional and international peace, fostering tolerance, encouraging dialogue, and advocating for the protection of human rights. The following are excerpts of the speeches made during this month's event.

Rules-based order 'intends' to add 'confusion'

Alena Douhan UN Special Rapporteur

As a Special Rapporteur on the Negative Impact of Unilateral Coercive Measures on the Enjoyment of Human Rights, I presented a number of reports addressing various elements. I have to admit that unfortunately, unilateral coercive measures have a very serious detrimental impact on the peace, security, and stability in different parts of the world. Overall, it's necessary to say that unilateral sanctions affect the stabilities in the subjected countries and due to the spillover effect, they affect the whole region. I will give you a few examples. First of all, in the majority of countries, as soon as unilateral sanctions are enforced, the situation becomes less stable. Quite often, a higher level of inflation is observed, the level of poverty grows, and people lose access to basic needs, including specific types of medicine, and have to move to neighboring countries. They move to neighboring countries because of not being able

to cover the different expenses at home or to get access to necessary medicine, education, or treatment, thereby creating instability in the region. This, in turn, poses a threat to international peace and security. A very important challenge posed by unilateral sanctions revolves around refugees. Here, we could observe several examples. In particular, Iran is hosting a huge number of Afghan refugees. For a long time, Iran has also been the subject of both international and unilateral sanctions. and we must take into account the economic situation in Iran. Due to unilateral sanctions, Iran is left alone to handle the situation with refugees. Many people are moving away from a country because of being desperate. So, they often do not have any place to go and do not have any money on them. Another sphere, which is included in the global fight against international terrorism as well as other international crimes, concerns the adherence to the rule of law. As I repeatedly reflected,

the unilateral sanctions are fully illegal, and as a result, they do not adhere to the rule of law. There is currently a tendency to supplement the rule of law with the so-called rules-based order, which is basically other rules that are intended to be imposed by those countries that impose sanctions that have nothing to do with international law in reality. At the same time, due to the use of very similar words, it intends to provide additional confusion in the international area, especially in the sphere of international law. Another very important challenge undermining international peace and security is the effect of unilateral sanctions on international collaboration. In order to be able to attain international peace and security, states shall work together. They shall look for ways to settle their disputes peacefully. Unfortunately, the tendency to impose unilateral sanctions tries to put one state above another state, saying, "This is how you should act or we will punish you." That violates the

principle of equality of states and the principle of non-intervention in the domestic affairs of states, and it doesn't find solutions to the disputes. It, vice versa, makes

relations between countries much worse.

Secondly, when it comes to cooperation, a number of other international treaties have been violated. A very clear example is the Treaty of Amity between Iran and the United States of America, which has been recently withdrawn by the US. Many multilateral treaties cannot be implemented due to unilateral sanctions. From the point of international law, states cannot withdraw from a treaty at any time. Every treaty sets forth a procedure for withdrawal. International law is based on the principles of sustainability and predictability of international relations. At the minimum, one state shall inform all other states about its willingness to withdraw 12 months in advance, in accordance with the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

