**Statement of the Professors of University of Kashan in condemnation of the aggressive Zionist entity's attack on the Islamic Republic of Iran**

**We condemn the attack of the Zionist regime on the Islamic Republic of Iran**

**1. Violation of the original prohibition of forced access and Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter:**

In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Declaration, it states: “Every member of the international community shall enjoy the territorial integrity or political sovereignty of any nation without the threat of force or coercion.”

This principle, the backbone of the international legal order, dates back to 1945 and any deviation from it can only be restored within the framework of the legitimate defense authorized by Article 51 of the Security Council. The Israeli attack on Iran has always been sanctioned by the Security Council and is therefore a fundamental violation of this principle.

Specifically, Article 51 of the UN Charter states: “In the event of an armed attack on a member of the United Nations, the Security Council shall take appropriate measures to preserve peace Nothing in this document shall prevent the right to individual or collective self-defense.”

Two basic conditions are mentioned in this article:

1. Actual Armed Attack

2. Immediate notification to the Security Council

In the well-known case Nicaragua v. United States (ICJ, 1986), the International Court of Justice emphasized that legitimate defense is only available against actual and not potential prejudicial attack. Israel has no documentary evidence of the occurrence or imminent occurrence of the attack from Iran. Similarly, preemptive defense, in the sense of attacking the enemy before an actual attack, is a problem only in political doctrine and not in the international judicial arena. The well-known Caroline Test from the nineteenth century only reflects the legitimacy of this type of defense:

• Immediate threats, abductions are unpredictable and decisive;

• No healthy treasures are good for the rest;

• Responsive, necessary, immediate and appropriate.

In the latest Israeli attack, none of these conditions are observed. Not only does there not exist an immediate threat, but the basis for preliminary action based on speculation about the uncertain future is in trouble. In this regard, this attack is considered “preemptive” and not “anticipatory” and is illegal under international law.

**2. Violation of International Humanitarian Law (IHL):**

In accordance with the basic principles of IHL (1949 Conventions and Protocols of Human Rights), any military operation should:

• Distinguish between systemic and non-systemic objectives;

• Suitable for good threats;

• Carried out with caution and with the least possible damage.

During the Israeli attack, many civilians lost their lives. The attack on the peaceful institutions of a state, even in the obligation to withdraw from the NPT, is highly credible.

In accordance with Article 56 of the First Haqi Protocol of 1977 to the 1949 Women's Conventions, “facilities containing dangerous weapons” should not be targeted, even if they have good military objectives The attack was decided. The reason for this prohibition is the danger that attacks on these institutions could pose to the informal community. This article only provides for the direct use of these facilities in military operations, in the form of exceptional permission to attack, but also with due regard to the original appropriateness and accurate prediction. Based on the studies of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in 2005, the prohibition of attacks on objects containing dangerous energy is recognized in accordance with customary and international law. Similarly, in international law, all individuals, even military commanders, have only the language of legitimate targets that are actively involved in an armed conflict. The regimes outside the frontlines are irregular and aim to end their war crimes. As a result, I point out that in addition to violating the UN Declaration, I approve of war crimes under the Constitution the International Criminal Court should be considered.

**3. International Human Rights Violations:**

According to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), the right to life (Article 6) is an inalienable right. Even in the case of armed conflict, states are subject to this right. Any attack that is carried out without prior attack, without the authorization of the Security Council, without due regard to proportionality, and is a form of irregular killing is clearly in violation of Article 6.

**4. Legal and Political Messages for the International System:**

If the aggressive actions of the United States and the Zionist regime continue without the consent of the international community, the international legal system will be shaken. Officially recognizing preventive defense, the legislative house is the preemptive use of too much that works to overthrow the initial system on the UN charter.