

## Diplomacy Decapitated

## 'Opportunity for dialogue missed':

## Iran rebukes UNSC's pro-snapback vote

Russia, China, Pakistan, Algeria rap E3 actions as 'unjustified and illegal'

## International Desk

Iran's ambassador to the UN reacted in the strongest terms to a vote on Friday by the UN Security Council to reimpose sanctions on Tehran over its nuclear program, saying that council "missed the opportunity for dialogue and agreement today."

Amir Saeed Iravani called the resolution which advanced European-triggered international sanctions on Tehran "hasty, unnecessary and unlawful."

"Today's action is hasty, unnecessary and unlawful. Iran recognizes no obligation to implement it," Iravani told the UN Security Council, describing it as the "politics of coercion."

"This reckless step undermines dialogue without aggression and sets a dangerous precedent," he added. "The E3 (France, Britain, Germany) and the US, in coordination with Israel, are spreading false claims that Iran's nuclear program threatens peace and security."

His remarks came after the Security Council resolution aimed at halting

the reimposition of sanctions on Iran failed after weeks of diplomatic talks.

The resolution put forth by South Korea, the current president of the 15-member council, did not garner the support of the nine countries required to halt the series of sanctions from taking effect at the end of the month, as outlined in Iran's 2015 nuclear deal with world powers, which is known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

Only four countries — China, Russia, Pakistan and Algeria — supported the effort, with some using the meeting to blast the European leaders for an unjustified and illegal action against Iran.

Iravani thanked his four colleagues for voting in favor of lifting the sanctions and rejecting "the blunt instrument of pressure and intimidation."

"They have chosen to stand on the right side of history," he said. Vassily Alekseevich Nebeniza, the Russian ambassador to the UN, said ahead of the vote that, "Their only goal now is to use the council

as a tool for their bad faith play, as a lever to exert pressure on the state in favor of a state which is trying to defend its sovereign interests."

## End to years of diplomacy

The Chinese envoy echoed that sentiment, saying that the council's action on this issue has managed to bring a "definitive" end to eight years of diplomacy with "one stroke."

British Ambassador Barbara Woodward said the UK remains committed to a diplomatic solution and is ready for further engagements diplomatically in the next week and beyond to seek to resolve differences.

France, Germany and the United Kingdom moved last month to trigger the "snapback mechanism," which automatically reimposes all UN sanctions that were in effect before the nuclear deal. Those penalties included a conventional arms embargo, restrictions on ballistic missile development, asset freezes, travel bans and a ban on producing nuclear-related technology.

The European parties have accused

Iran of non-compliance with its obligations under the JCPOA over its decision to reduce commitments in response to the US withdrawal from the 2015 deal.

Iran argues that the E3 cannot invoke the mechanism as they first violated the agreement by refusing to compensate for the US withdrawal, which prompted Iran to reduce its commitments.

## 'Unjustified, provocative' move

Iran's Foreign Ministry in a statement described the move by the three European countries as "illegal, unjustified, and provocative", which severely undermines the ongoing diplomatic processes.

The statement underlined that, "Iran's peaceful nuclear program is based on the will and determination of the Iranian people for scientific and technological progress and development, and the Iranian nation remains resolute in this path. The Islamic Republic of Iran, while emphasizing the pursuit of its interests and rights — including through diplomatic means — re-



Iranian Ambassador to the UN Amir Saeed Iravani (c) speaks with his British counterpart Barbara Woodward (R) during a Security Council meeting on Iran at UN headquarters in New York on September 19, 2025.  
ANGELA WEISS/AFP

serves the right to respond appropriately to any illegal action."

Over the last several weeks, intensified diplomacy between Iran and the European countries had taken place.

German and European Union leaders had warned Iran in a call on Wednesday that it had yet to take the necessary action to stop the reimposition of sanctions against the Islamic Republic.

"What Europeans are doing is politically biased and politically motivated ... They are wrong on different levels by trying to misuse the mechanism embedded in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)," Deputy Foreign Minister Saeed Khatibzadeh said on Friday.

Khatibzadeh cautioned that, "All options are on the table if diplomacy fails."

"If Europeans go on this path, they are making the level of unpredictability to the highest level possible, and they are responsible for... any possible future risks," he declared.

World's inaction on anti-Iran strikes leads to normalization of aggression: *Iran envoy*

## International Desk

Iran's ambassador to international organizations in Vienna once again censured attacks on the country's nuclear sites by the United States and Israel in June, warning that the international community's inaction over such strikes would lead to the normalization and repetition of the illegal acts.

Addressing the 69<sup>th</sup> IAEA General Conference in Geneva on Thursday, Reza Najafi called for Washington and Tel Aviv to be held accountable for their "blatant violation of international law and the non-proliferation regime."

"Today, the international community is facing a very serious issue; a clear message must be sent that illegal attacks on nuclear facilities under the safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) are not only a blatant violation of countries' legitimate rights to the peaceful use of nuclear energy, but also a direct assault on the credibility of the IAEA's safeguards system."

The Iranian official also pointed to a draft resolution put forward by Tehran and five other nations at the IAEA's conference, which calls for a ban on any attack or threat against nuclear sites under the IAEA Safeguards, saying that many member states of the IAEA are under pressure and threats from the



US not to support the draft resolution. "A considerable number of IAEA member states, in separate contacts with Iran and other sponsors of the draft resolution, have stated that they are under intense pressure and threats from the United States not to vote in favor of the submitted resolution," Najafi said. Meanwhile, the Iranian diplomat said in an interview with IRNA that the United States has threatened the IAEA member states to cast a negative vote or abstain from voting on Iran's resolution.

"A number of these countries have declared that an 'abstention' from this resolution does not reflect their true position, and therefore they have

strongly requested Iran, in consultation with the other co-sponsors of the resolution, to defer action on the resolution to next year's conference."

The resolution follows the US-Israeli aggression against Iran in June, with Tehran warning that the attacks on its safeguarded nuclear facilities have endangered personnel, nuclear material security, the environment, and the credibility of the non-proliferation regime.

Iran's Fordow, Natanz and Isfahan nuclear facilities were bombed by the US, which joined Israel's aggression against Iran in June and claimed the lives of nearly 1,100 Iranian ordinary people, high-profile scientists and military forces.

## Tehran concerned about foreign agendas backing 'federalization' of Syria

## International Desk

Iran's ambassador to the United Nations expressed concern regarding agendas advocating for the "federalization" of Syria, saying that any attempts to impose external agendas or fragment the nation is unacceptable.

Addressing a UN Security Council meeting on Syria on Thursday, Amir Saeid Iravani said that such aspirations could exacerbate fragmentation and reignite conflict within the country.

"We reiterate that the sovereignty, unity, and territorial integrity of Syria must be fully respected. Any attempt to impose foreign agendas or dismember the country is unacceptable," Iravani said.

"We express concern about agendas or demands that could lead to federalization or autonomy. If mismanaged, such demands could lead to fragmentation and a resurgence of conflicts; however, if pursued responsibly within the framework of an inclusive national dialogue under the supervision of the United Nations, they can contribute to national reconciliation and stability." The Iranian diplomat underlined that the Islamic Republic will continue to support the Syrian people and their efforts to restore peace, stability, reconstruction, and national reconciliation, in full alignment with the will of the Syrian people. He emphasized that lasting peace and stability can only be achieved through a Syrian-owned and Syrian-led political process, free from foreign interference and coercion.

"This process must be genuinely inclusive of all communities. Excluding key groups would only deepen grievances, undermine legitimacy, and risk destabilizing an already fragile situation," he remarked.

Iravani stressed that the UN Security Council must not overlook the ongoing destabilizing and aggressive actions of the Israeli regime in Syria.

## 'Foreign occupation must come to an end'

He also condemned Israel's acts of aggression against Syria as blatant violations of international law and the UN Charter.

"Iran underscores that all foreign occupation must come to an end. Israeli acts of aggression, including repeated airstrikes on Syrian territory, represent clear violations of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. The Council must not remain silent on these violations," Iravani concluded.

Israel has conducted repeated acts of aggression across the Syrian territory following the collapse of former president Bashar al-Assad's government last year to weaken the Arab country's defensive capabilities.

Israeli forces have deployed to at least nine posts deep inside southern Syria, mostly within the UN-monitored buffer zone, citing the alleged need to counter Daesh's threats. However, this deployment serves as cover for a broader strategy of territorial expansion through both military aggression and settler incursions.



Mohammad Ali Rajabi  
Cartoonist

## International agreements as ...

One of the most significant treaties in this context is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation

## Page 1 &gt;

Treaty (NPT), adopted in 1968 and joined by 190 countries. The treaty restricts nuclear-armed states and obliges them to pursue disarmament in good faith. At the same time, it requires non-nuclear states to refrain from developing such weapons and to accept comprehensive safeguards with the IAEA over their nuclear material.

Article 4 of the NPT, however, explicitly recognizes the "inalienable right" of all member states to research, develop, and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Yet for decades, the atmosphere surrounding nuclear issues has been dominated by suspicion. The pursuit of peaceful nuclear technology by non-nuclear states has been met with distrust and alarm from nuclear-armed nations. The reason lies in the weak structure of the NPT, which is built

on discrimination among member states and has been kept deliberately fragile by Western powers. Countries joined the treaty mainly in the hope of benefiting from Article 4, which guaranteed access to peaceful nuclear energy. Although the NPT was originally intended to halt the spread of nuclear weapons, Western powers have used the excuse of proliferation risks to pile on restrictions.

Global policies shaped by the "non-proliferation doctrine," spearheaded by superpowers such as the United States, have significantly eroded Article 4—particularly the inherent right of member states to peaceful nuclear energy. As former IAEA Board of Governors chairman Bertrand Goldschmidt once noted: "Until the mid-1970s, IAEA safeguards and NPT policies were free of any technical restrictions. At that time, the NPT could be summed up in one sentence: nuclear explosions were banned,

and everything else was allowed. Nothing in the treaty prevented member states from pursuing technical paths of their choice." In other words, before Washington shifted strategy in the 1980s and started clamping down on sensitive nuclear activities, non-nuclear states were entitled to enjoy the full benefits of Article 4 without fear of economic sanctions or military threats. The hardline approach taken by powers like the US has since triggered serious global crises and jeopardized international peace and security.

Despite this, neither the US, nor any of the other eight nuclear-armed states have joined the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), adopted in 2017. The TPNW is the first legally binding international treaty that lays down sweeping bans on every activity related to nuclear arms, from development and testing to possession, stockpiling, use, and threats of use.

