



Science Arena Publications
Specialty Journal of Politics and Law

ISSN: 2520-3282

Available online at www.sciarena.com

2019, Vol, 4 (3): 1-15

Terrorist Reading Corps by America, Action in the Direction of Global Peace or War?

Alireza Movahedi

Master of International Law, Tehran-Jonoub University, Tehran, Iran.

Abstract: *The development of the phenomenon of terrorism in recent years and its emergence as an international threat has involved various areas and various international mechanisms. These include international law. For most international law theorists, the question is whether international law can play an active and practical role in a highly secure world? While the evolution of mechanisms and mechanisms for defining, clarifying, defining and confronting international terrorism in international law has been slow to move towards other areas. Perhaps one of the reasons is the prohibition of the use of force in accordance with article 4, paragraph 2, of the United Nations Charter, which prohibits any use of force in international relations, except in accordance with the arrangements specified in Chapter VII of the Charter. However, dealing with terrorism, due to the nature of this phenomenon, and in particular its non-governmental nature, requires increased security powers of states, and the creation of security-based security mechanisms beyond what Article 51 provides. In fact, the principle of the prohibition of the use of force in international relations, as the principle that many international relations thinkers refer to as "the norm and rule of international law in the 21st century", is in doubt.*

Keywords: *Terrorist Reading Corps , America , War , Peace*

INTRODUCTION

Terrorist word for word

Terrorism (in French: terreure) means "horror" in French. The first application of the word "assassination" in the modern world, as in many modern concepts, including "advancement", comes from the French Revolution, and, conversely, today, it has a positive meaning. In Dehkhoda's dictionary, "Terreur's assassination, meaning political killing by means of weapons in Persian, is commonplace with the use of modern-day Arabs, instead of assassination, in French, which means horror and terror, and the rule of terror is also the principles of government A revolution that was deployed in France after the fall of the Girondins (from May 31, 1793 to 1794) and involved many political executions. "

Distribution of terrorist attacks in the world from 1970 to 2015, Orange: 1970 to 1999, Red 2000-2017.

Means terrorist in the term

Terrorism, referred to as "horror", in the Persian language, is "bullying", the use of violence or the threat of using violence to achieve political, religious, or ideological goals. Of course, in today's world, the exact definition of the term "terrorism" is not available.

In modern times, terrorism is one of the main causes of the threat of society and, according to anti-terrorism laws, is considered a victim in most countries of the world by the judicial system. Also, in the war against non-combatants, such as ordinary citizens, impartial forces or war prisoners, it is a war crime.

A wide range of political organizations, such as left-wing groups, right-wing groups, nationalists, religious groups, revolutionaries, and even ruling governments, have been using their means to advance their own goals of terrorism.

In today's world, the exact definition of the term "terrorism" is not provided. Because there is no definition of terrorism in the United Nations that is agreed upon by all member states.

Definitions of International Terrorism

As mentioned above, the first attempts to define the definition of terrorist acts is based on the Geneva Convention of 1937 (UN, 1972). Since then, the introduction of a comprehensive definition of international terrorism has always been difficult. The ambiguity in the definition makes it difficult to create international legal mechanisms.

The experience of the years following the Geneva Convention of 1937 shows that sectional conventions have made it easier to define international terrorism because they have focused on more specific aspects of terrorist acts or instances.

The Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft (1970) can be seen as an example in Article 1 of which states that any illegal takeover of an aircraft is a clear indication of a terrorist act. In Article 2 of the same Convention, all States Parties are bound to impose such a person or persons the most severe punishment.

Such a definition later became the basis for the definition of crime in the international sectional mechanism. As a result, if we put together parts of the convention, we can achieve the following:

Illicit actions against the safety of civilian aircraft (1971), crimes against internationally protected persons, such as diplomats and political representatives (1973), hostages (1979), theft, theft or any illegal possession of nuclear material or threats such as that (1979), Illicit Violence at Airports (1988), Illegal Activities Against Continental Shelter Oilfields (1988), Terrorist Bombings (1997), and Terrorist Financing (1999).

Of course, it should be noted that in the annex to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorists, there is a list of nine universal-convention conventions that were initiated by the International Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Uses of Aircraft (1970) and terminated by the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (1997). The first paragraph of Article 1 of this Convention also refers to the definitions given in these conventions and in the annex. In Article 23, it is also noted that in the future, a new list will be added to the list in the Appendix.

The use of the examples referred to in the Universal Part of the Convention effectively raises the challenge of achieving a comprehensive definition of international terrorism. Of course, some district-level conventions have tried to define the definition of international terrorism.

This includes the 1971 United States Organization of States Parties Convention, which recognizes terrorist acts as "criminal acts against individuals or similar crimes that are of international importance" (Article 2). All conventions of a part of the member states request that the specific cases defined by these conventions be considered as a clear indication of crime and lawfulness and punish them in proportion to the crime.

As stated above, the first comprehensive international definition of terrorist acts is the Geneva Convention of 1937. This Convention defines terrorist acts as "criminal actions against a state aimed at terrorizing individuals and groups or at the community level" (Article 1, paragraph 1, 1972, UN). The Convention provides more details in different cases, such as Article 2, paragraphs 1 (a), 1 (b) and 1 (c) referring to acts that cause death or injury or deprivation of liberty, Or article 2, paragraph 3, of arbitrary measures that endanger the lives of the people. Paragraph 2 of Article 2 refers to arbitrary acts that lead to the destruction of public property. Article 2, paragraph 5, deals with production, and the possession of weapons, ammunition or explosive and destructive substances. Conspiracy, provocation to commit a criminal act, incite people to do something, even if they are not successful, or voluntary participation and cooperation in criminal acts are among the issues referred to in this Convention. Dugard believes that the breadth of the definition of the

Geneva Convention from international terrorism and the widespread scope of areas actually led the few governments to ratify the convention. (Dugard, 1973,94)

This process has continued since then, and governments have not been able to achieve a comprehensive definition of international terrorism. In 1972, the Specialized Terrorism Committee was set up at the United Nations, and the member states made great efforts to provide appropriate definitions of international terrorism, but because of strong political differences, they effectively achieved a proper definition of international terrorism and comprehensive conventions on this issue. It was impossible.

(Franck & Lockwood, 1974). The restoration of the Terrorism Committee at the end of the 1990s was largely able to shape these efforts.

In addition to the two successful regional mechanisms (the International Convention for the Suppression of the Terrorist Bombing (1997) and the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (1999)), the Terrorism Committee drafted a comprehensive Comprehensive Counter-Terrorism Comprehensive Convention based on a draft submitted by India. Assumed Most Committee members believe that the text of Article 2 presented at the Committee's sixth session in 2002 can be a good basis for defining. However, issues such as the conditions,

reservations and exceptions by member states continue to lead to a lack of consensus and a comprehensive understanding of the subject. In fact, in order to combat international terrorism, a coordinated strategy is needed in order to coordinate all efforts against terrorism. The actions taken by governments and the international community to deal with the threat of terrorism must be subject to a basic principle, and that priority must be given to justice and justice. There are two main issues in this regard, which are more than the rest of the disputed. The first is the difference between terrorist acts and liberation movements that are fighting for autonomy. Some comprehensive regional mechanisms have addressed this issue. For example, paragraph A of article 2 of the Arab Convention on the Elimination of Terrorism (2004) or paragraph A of Article 2 of the Convention on the Suppression of the Suppression of Terrorism of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (1999).

The second issue is the issue of state terrorism. This has become more important, especially after the Zionist regime's actions to formalize the assassination of political leaders of the Palestinian Liberation Movement, and to expand its scope to assassinate political leaders opposed to the regime in different countries.

The lack of a clear and comprehensive definition of international terrorism remains problematic. Some conventions, such as Article 1 of the European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism (1977) and its Supplementary Protocol of 15 May 2003, or Article 2 of the United States Convention against Terrorism (2002), and others, include in their text a list of universal or some of the conventions of the world. Have brought. (UN, 2002a). These conventions have sought to identify the factual and subjective aspects of criminal acts.

In addition to these, some regional conventions have tried to combine the two above mentioned issues by combining different definitions.

The difference between terror and terrorism

The oppression and other forms of assassination, although usually carried out in a framework of panic (terrorism), but there are significant differences between terrorism and assassination. The concept of the word terror is an important ambiguity about the nature of the assassination. The word "assassination" (revolutionary execution) is sometimes used to legitimize the actions of terrorists. Some scholars such as David Rapoport and Ivyansky consider the current theory of assassination taken from the theory of oppression. Nowadays, a tendency exists for the inclusion of political killings within the framework of terrorism and, on the other hand, many terrorist groups also use tactics of political murder.

The most obvious distinction between assassination and terrorism is that the goal of a political assassin is a certain person and a weapon to destroy him. But the purpose of a terrorist act is a group.

Rapport proposes an innovative method for distinguishing political murder from terrorist acts, in which instead of the "action breath" is considered "the meaning of action". He regards terrorism as a process and political murder as an event; he "destroys the political killer who, in his opinion, has made a system corrupt. But the terrorist destroys the military, which has already spoiled anyone who has been in it. Political murder of an incident is a transitory thing and an event, but terrorism is a process and a way of life".

UNIDER AIRLINES Flying No. 175 following the September 11, 2001 attacks in New York to the South Tower of the World Trade Center.

Political assassination

Politics refers to acts of violence and illegal government to suppress their opponents and to frighten them with state assassinations, as well as acts of militant groups that commit violent and horrific acts to achieve their political goals.

Attacks like the terrorists' action to destroy the twin towers of the World Trade Organization on September 11, 2001 are terrorist operations

State terrorism

The term government terrorism is a controversial word. Government terrorism is a term used to interfere with a state or government in the internal or external affairs of another government by carrying out or participating in terrorist operations or by supporting military operations to decay, undermine or overthrow the government or the whole of its ruling apparatus.

Material and spiritual contributions (such as political support) to opposition groups and participation in operations such as bombing, landing ports and beaches, kidnapping, hijacking, and assassinations of high-ranking state officials are examples of government terrorism.

Brian Jenkins, a well-known journalist in the subject of terrorism, defines state terrorism as "war by vice president.

" "These countries (followers of state terrorism) are aware of the limits of conventional wars, so they prefer to use the facilities of terrorist organizations that they have created or funded by them," he says.

To threaten the enemy or disrupt the political and economic stability of that country or to create political and economic instability in that country. " Jenkins believes that this form of terrorism requires much less investment than conventional warfare, disrupting the enemy, and denying communication with terrorists in general.

Tehran's 2017 attacks on the building of the Islamic Consultative Assembly.

The Difference Between State and Non-Governmental Terrorism

The major difference between government terrorism and nongovernmental terrorism is its implementation. That is, the executor and designer of non-state terrorist acts of individuals, groups and parties, and the designer and designer of state terrorist acts, are a state or a number of particular governments.

In addition, government or government involvement in terrorist acts is twofold:

Directly; that is, the state itself is committing terrorist acts against another state.

Indirectly, through the sending of material aid such as weapons, ammunition and advanced military equipment, to the opposition groups of the said government or to provide political, economic or promotional support to the groups.

According to the authors of the Dictionary of Political and Strategic Thesaurus, three categories should be exempted from state terrorism and considered non-governmental:

- National liberation groups
- Revolutionary groups
- Ethnic or religious groups

Timothy MacWay's terrorist operation destroyed Oklahoma City's federal building

International law and terrorism

The 1937 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism (Geneva Convention, 1937) can be considered the first International Covenant on Terrorism (UN, 1972). Since then, not only has the concept of terrorism undergone many changes, but international mechanisms also have an independent, yet more comprehensive foundation of domains and topics.

If in 1937 terrorism was more of an internal phenomenon, today it would be less possible to use terrorism without its "international" extension.

Similarly, treaties and mechanisms related to this phenomenon have also taken on many multilateral, regional and international aspects. One can refer to the 1977 European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism and its Additional Protocol of 15 May 2003. Of course, some bilateral mechanisms, such as the 1973 United States-Cuba Agreement, are still working to deal with all terrorist acts.

But in any case, in the contemporary international system, the main mechanism of countering terrorism is their "internationalization" and "inclusiveness". Inclusiveness means that the principle of accepting and committing to these mechanisms is not satisfaction, but the international norm makes the proximity of countries to these mechanisms as legitimate or prestigious and effective in determining the international status of countries. .

Although the Geneva Convention of 1937 has never been implemented, it can not be ignored as the first multilateral anti-terror convention. In addition, the convention was accompanied by another international treaty that foresees the first international criminal tribunal to punish terrorists. Conv. Gen. 1937, Geneva, for the first time, described the concept of terrorist acts as follows: "Criminal actions against a state aimed at terrorizing individuals and groups or at the community level" (Article I, paragraph 1, 1972, UN.)

An important point that has always been ambiguous in the international conventions and mechanisms of combating terrorism is aspects of individual security and state security. That is, the terrorist act targets both the health and the lives of the people and the security and the vital interests of the political system. So it is unclear whether terrorism is an internal or international act. However, today, despite the 70 years since the Geneva Convention, terrorism remains a major contributor to the United Nations agenda and other international institutions that have an impact on the formulation of international law and procedures.

International conventions and treaties on terrorism are different in nature or subject matter. Therefore, they can be divided into two groups of Comprehensive Conventions or Part , on the one hand, and Regional and Universal Conventions on the other. Of course, in some cases, a combination of the two groups can be seen. For example, the Geneva Convention of 1937 can be referred to as a Convention that is Comprehensive and Global (UN, 1972), or the Comprehensive Convention, such as the Convention of the Americas for Combating Terrorism 2002 (UN, 2004),

which at the same time A regional convention. On the other hand, some conventions are part of, in the sense that they deal only with some aspects of terrorism.

These conventions are also somewhat global. (Such as the Convention on the Prohibition of the Illicit Occupation of Aircraft, 1970). Some also have regional aspects, such as the Organization of American States Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorist Acts for the Purposes of Crime Against Persons and Similar Matters of International Importance, 1971.

It should be noted that among the global conventions on the fight against terrorism, excellence has been with conventions that are essentially partitioned, and in regional conventions of excellence with those that are comprehensive. (Galicki, 2005)

Since today we have about 20 regional and international conventions on combating international terrorism, this concept can be viewed from a variety of dimensions. For example, their definitions of crime, scope of crime, exceptions, censures, instruments used by member states, obligations, internal judicial procedures, obligations and obligations of member states for cooperation, offender rights, extradition of offenders, and exceptions to extradition And judicial cooperation.

An examination of these cases can determine which mechanism is more effective in countering international terrorism than others. Another important issue in this regard is the bilateral relationship between the comprehensive and partial conventions and their parallel mode.

Why did Tropez read the Tramp on Monday for a terrorist read?

US President Donald Tramp, on Monday, signed the Revolutionary Guard's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC) in an unconventional and contradictory manner with international norms on the list of foreign terrorist organizations.

With this decision, Tramp transformed America into the first country in the world to list the official military force of a country that emerges from the constitution of that country on the terrorist list.

Of course, Tramp had been seeking the Terrorist reading of the Revolutionary Guard since his arrival in the White House, and last June, cyanating, quoting well-informed sources, reported that the US government was seriously considering a military read military readmission attempt to increase pressure on Iran. Its powerful in the region.

But why did the president of the United States make a decision that had many opponents at the White House, and several times delayed due to security considerations and explicit warnings by intelligence agencies?

The only response that can be made to this question is the sensitive parliamentary elections of the Zionist regime that is taking place today (Tuesday); the election of Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in light of the polls and allegations in the relationship With corruption and abuse of power against him, he faces a tough challenge to succeed.

As some US sources have said to CNN, "The terrorist readings of the Revolutionary Guard are more symbolic, as the entity now sees Washington as a terrorist entity under the decree issued by former President George W. Bush after the September 9 attacks. And Tramp issued a decree on sanctions against the Revolutionary Guards in October last year, "but the official announcement of a general election in the occupied territories within a few hours can not have any other purpose than Netanyahu's election campaign.

Formerly, however, Tramp had also taken many controversial decisions in support of Netanyahu, one of the most important of which was the identification of the Qods occupied as the capital of the Zionist regime, the transfer of the US embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, and the acceptance of the claim that the regime was ruling the Occupied Golan Syria, and the terrorist readings of the Revolutionary Guards was in fact the last shot that he threw for Netanyahu's election.

On the other hand, a look at Netanjah's message to Tramp after the Revolutionary Guards' terrorist reader also clearly reveals the fact that he deliberately denied the night by saying "Thank you for answering another important request." The election has been aimed at revealing its role in this decision and its impact on voters. Matthew Mabon, a senior correspondent for the French news agency last night, announced in a report that support for Netanyahu on the eve of the Israeli election was one of the main reasons for the American decision to read the Revolutionary Guard a terrorist at that time.

But another question that is raised here is why Tramp insists on supporting Netanyahu and his party's victory in the parliamentary elections of the Zionist regime. The answer to this question is also clear and relates to the prominent role of the Jewish lobby in the US presidential election.

Tramp has been strongly supported by the lobbies because of the severe criticism he faces in foreign policy and the charges that he faces in connection with electoral collusion with Russia and the payment of a royalty to a female actor to disclose his illegitimate relationship. The American Jew needs a presidential election of 2020. In addition, the Democrats' victory in the US House of Representatives last year and the mounting speculation about his alleged impeachment have added to his concerns over the past few days.

Tramp knows well that American Jews are traditionally pro-Democrats, and that the Likud Party of Israel, which is currently chaired by Netanyahu, has a high influence among American Jewish lobbyists.

For this reason, supporting Netanyahu in the Zionist regime's general election can be a win-win game for him, especially given Democrats' presidential candidates have already shown a good chance of winning him in the next year's elections.

Trump's opponents from the beginning of his presidency had hoped that proving that his campaign headquarters with the Russians would collide with the case's special investigator could force a president out of power for the first time in US history, but now the scandal with a female actress in pornographic films Every day, a new release is being published, and the confessions that his former attorney recently committed against his financial and ethical misconduct during the election has given the job where Trump now supports the Zionist regime and Netanyahu as an opportunity to win the most votes. Jews look.

Meanwhile, Trump's unpopularity for a significant portion of the American society and his controversial policies with regard to his neighbors, European allies, trade partners and NATO, as well as his neglect of international treaties and agreements, has also led him to demand more votes than ever before. Jews, and most important of all, are their financial and media support for their campaign, because if it can not increase its chances by next year, it is unlikely that speculation about the probability of a period of its becoming a reality color is unlikely.

The US aims to read the Revolutionary Guard terrorist; war or negotiation?

US President Donald Trump, announcing the announcement, said the United States has placed the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps on the list of foreign terrorist organizations. "The United States considers the entirety of a military and security institution of another country as a terrorist group, an unpopular event that is taking place for the first time in the world,

" Mr Bavand said of the US president's move to Euronews. . Of course, the United States had already banned the Quds Force and the Revolutionary Guards and some of its military commanders, but this time it has raised the Revolutionary Guard as a terrorist entity.

This is a new pressure lever in the wake of previous economic and political pressures. As I said, there is no precedent for a country in which the military forces of another country have such a policy. Air Force, Naval, Ground and Engineering Air Force. Whether the whole of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps is regarded as a terrorist entity with all its organizational structure has neither a history nor a justification. It is very different from being a part or group of a large terrorist organization, despite the fact that the entire military forces of an official military institution consider a country as a terrorist.

In his statement, Mr. Trampam argued that "Iran is not only a state sponsor of terrorism, but the Revolutionary Guards Corps is actively involved in financing its budget and uses terrorism as a state tool." He also called the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps "the main tool of the Iranian government To guide and use their terrorist activities in the world" .

Most of the world's regional and regional powers have been supporting Middle Eastern terrorists.

"Formerly, Palestinian groups were more famously known for terrorist groups because of their struggle with Israel," said Hermida Bound, a senior US official regarding the support of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps. For example, the groups of George Hubash and Vayyeb Hawatma, and Fatah and al-Shabaqah. Israel considered all Palestinian groups as terrorists, and the Americans considered these groups as terrorists following Israel. But after the 9/11 incident, with the advent of al-Qaeda, the issue of international terrorism was raised. Al-Qaeda had Salafi values and was a militant and jihadist group, financed financially by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, politically from the United States, Britain and Pakistan. Al-Qaeda was introduced to the US embassy in Tanzania and Kenya by explosive attack, followed by the 9/11 incident. After al-Qaeda, ISIS was created and after the Arab Spring, groups were set up against the political systems of the Arab world. These groups were supported by both Western and non-Western countries in Egypt and Libya and Syria. Clinton officially announced that we were wrong to support these groups. Therefore, the United States and other countries have supported such groups. If a government has supported one of these groups,

should that government be supportive of terrorism forever, or should it be said that such support has a cross-sectional dimension?

The Turkish government supported a large number of dissidents, Bashar al-Assad, and even had a database of them. But now he has withdrawn from these support and has been aligned with Russia and Iran in relation to the Syrian issue. Should Turkey and the Turkish army be considered as a supporter of terrorism? For how many years did the country support such groups" ?

"The IRGC and the Iranian government are carrying out terrorist acts in the world," said US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo yesterday, justifying the government's action against the Revolutionary Guards. The Corps now uses it in any way to exercise its power. "He also accused Qassim Soleimani, the Quds Force commander of the Revolutionary Guard, that" he is trying to extort the Islamic Revolution with violent methods to other countries. "

Consequences of placing the Iranian Revolutionary Guards in the list of terrorist groups

In his latest article, the senior member of the former nuclear team of our country, has examined the implications and consequences of listing the IRGC in the list of US terrorist groups.

According to the latest report by Seyed Hossein Mousavian, senior researcher at Princeton University and former diplomat of Iran, former Deputy Foreign Minister of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, Huffington Post wrote:

Putting the Revolutionary Guards in the list of US terrorist groups is four dangerous and undermining the stability and security of the region.

Reputable reports indicate that Trump has included the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps in the list of terrorist groups, although some US military-security organizations have warned the White House in this regard.

The undeniable fact is that the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps Qods Force and the Central Command of the United States have been in a tough challenge for three decades. Both forces in the early eighties, after the Iraqi invasion of Iran, are responsible for the formation and transboundary missions of their country.

Centcom's responsibility includes the command of the US Army forces in the Middle East, East Africa, and Central Asia. This geographic area includes Iran, neighboring countries of Iran, and an area that has an immediate impact on Iran's national security, and therefore the main area of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps is the Qods Force.

The United States and Iran both of their overseas missions called each other's military interference in the internal affairs of other countries and regions and accused each other of having a strategy of "hegemony and domination"

But the reality is that not only Iran and the United States, but also the armies of many countries, carry out cross-border missions, such as the presence of Saudi military forces in Bahrain, Turkish military operations in Syria and Iraq, Saudi military attack on Yemen and Russian military presence in Syria. The US military presence in other countries is the most important historical example in this case, including the widespread military presence in the Gulf.

There are four main reasons why placing the Iranian Revolutionary Guards in the list of terrorist groups would be dangerous to the national security of the United States and would undermine the stability and security of the region.

The first point is that the Sunni and Qatari forces are the most powerful and influential actors in Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon and the Persian Gulf. Even in Yemen, the United States and Saudi Arabia consider the influence of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force as their most important obstacle. Therefore, it is obvious that cooperation with the Iranian Army will be an integral part of any peaceful solution to existing crises in the region.

Therefore, placing the IRGC in the terrorist groups will close the door to opportunities for using diplomacy to resolve crises.

The second point is that the IRGC is an integral part of the armed forces of Iran, and thus placing the Iranian Revolutionary Guards in the list of terrorist groups will make Iran consider the opposing army as a terrorist group. Such a situation would mean the announcement of an informal war between the US and Iranian armies, and at least the result would be that the way of any direct or indirect cooperation between the two countries would be closed to regional crises.

The third point is that Trump said that fighting ISIS and eradicating this terrorist group would be the most important agenda for his government. Iran's armed forces are at the forefront of fighting ISIS in Syria and Iraq and the region. Russia's progress in fighting ISIS in Syria and the liberation of Aleppo was not possible without extensive cooperation with Iran.

Iraqi Kurdistan government officials said that without the help of Iran, Erbil had fallen on the capital of the Iraqi Kurdistan. Today, the role of the armed forces of Iran in the release of Mosul is key to ISIL's occupation. The US military's opposition to the Iranian army could be the most effective blow to the ISIS fight.

In Tehran, despite the differences of opinion between political groups, all Iranian political and national forces are united and united in supporting the Army and Armed Forces.

At the start of his work, Trump manifested his hostility to the eighty-millionth nation of Iran by issuing a decree prohibiting the entry of Muslims from seven countries, including Iran, and violated the rights and interests of the Iranian-American population of several hundreds of thousands of Americans. His marking on Iran's armed forces means the final blade of lobbies is the chance of any progress in relations.

Generals have taken power in America. Anyone who talks to them will accuse the deaths of 241 Americans in the Beirut bombing or the killing of American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, the scourge and the Iranian army.

Anyone who speaks with the Iranian authorities also contributed to the US military strike on Iranian naval installations, the attack on passenger aircraft and the killing of 291 innocent Iranian passengers, including 66 children, to support Saddam's invasion of Iran, which left hundreds of thousands dead and wounded. The United States will prosecute Saddam to use chemical weapons and kill and injure tens of thousands of Iranians.

The list of grimaces is long, but the same shame and history of 38 years after the 1979 Iranian revolution signaled the importance of preserving the fields of communication between the armed forces of Iran and the United States. At the end of the 1980s, President Bush, the father of the United States, called on Iran to release Iran from hostage-taking in Lebanon, and Iran's President Hashemi Rafsanjani promised that he would show goodwill in Iran's case.

At that time, I was in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Iran, and in a duet, we found the mission of the president to help release the American hostages. The mission was successful in a few months and American hostages were released. This success was due solely to the extraordinary cooperation of the IRGC Quds Force and the Iranian Ministry of Intelligence. Unfortunately, the US government did not thank Iran after the release of American hostages and not only failed to act on mutual goodwill but increased pressure on Iran.

Another example was after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack in New York when Bush Bush, President of the United States, was helping Iran to cooperate in the "war on terror" and demanded Iran's help.

At that time, I was responsible for the foreign policy affairs of the Secretariat of the National Security Council. Despite all the distrust, Iran responded positively to the US request and the Taliban were expelled from Kabul in collaboration with the Revolutionary Guard Corps. But as soon as the US forces arrived in Kabul, Bush called Iran the "axis of evil."

In the 2003 US invasion of Iraq, Saddam's controversial forces, who had been trained and well-trained in the Qods force for many years in Iran, were trained and formidated by a popular army, also practically cooperated with the US armed forces in Iraq against Saddam, but after the fall of Saddam The United States took the lead in defending Iran in Iraq.

The decline of the United States in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the subsequent losses, began when the United States stepped up its cooperation with Iran and opposed the armed forces of Iran.

Trump repeated mistakenly Bush in his attacks on Iraq and Afghanistan, and thousands of dollars in unprofitable US spending, but he is not aware of the causes of this failure, and thus he is taking the path of the past mistakes of the United States. In order to prevent the repetition of past mistakes, To cooperate with Iran.

The outbreak of war depends on the reaction of Iran

Mr. Bavand said that "the outbreak of war depends on the type of reaction," he said, referring to the current conflict between the two countries and the Middle East's political climate. In fact, everything depends on the mechanisms that are being adopted by Iran to respond to America. Military conflict is not decisive. From now on, there is no clear prediction of the results of the recent US government action. However, the likelihood of a war should not be underestimated. But ultimately, what will happen to the actions and reactions. The way Iran reacts can be in the direction of a war or to prevent it. "

The goal is to bring Iran back to the negotiating table

"The goal of the United States is to force Iran to agree," said the professor of international relations, in response to the question of whether Trump, with his recent action against the Revolutionary Guards, is about to step closer to war or wants to exert pressure on Iran, he said. . If the agreement is reached by the United States, the war will be eliminated. In this regard, the United States, according to its announcement, says that Iran's global danger is shrinking and that Trump is trying to win the presidential election with the same words. If Iran does not move to a US-oriented deal that seems to be on the horizon so far, it will not respond to such an agreement.

Whether or not a war will take place depends on what kind of responses the United States gives to the United States. Trump is putting more pressure on Iran to bring Iran to the negotiating table, and this recent US government action against the Revolutionary Guards is also in the process of bringing Iran to the negotiating table. The purpose of the trump is to force Iran to agree to the US agreement.

Possible Consequences of Iranian-American Confrontation

Mr Bavand referred to the emergence of a complex security crisis in the Middle East and the disturbance of calm in the area from the consequences of the recent US government action, and in response to the question of whether Americans, after that, have the right to themselves, Like the ISIL forces, and Iran, which considers the United States military forces in the Middle East to be a terrorist, reciprocally enjoys such a right. "Apparently, Americans seem to have such a right for themselves. That is, from the statement made by the President of the United States and his foreign minister yesterday. Naturally, the logical consequence of yesterday's Iran's position is nothing but the right to engage in such an action. Article 1 (2) of the Charter of the United Nations also speaks of equality of sovereignty. But as George Orwell, we are all equal, but some are more equal. Some world powers give themselves hegemony and punish others if they do not respect the demands and opinions of these powers.

The punitive action is different from the war

Hermides Bond, in response to the question that if war would be a brief military conflict or a full-blown war, he said: "This will no longer depend on the American decision. At Reagan's time, Iran's oil rigs destroyed the Persian Gulf, calling it "punitive measures". Punitive actions are different from large military actions. It should be seen what the American government will take in terms of its objectivity. Extensive and long-term military engagement does not constitute punitive measures, and does not mean war. War is a more general concept of punitive measures. Punitive action is limited to damage to military bases or oil installations. Even targeting the Airbus Iran in 1988 was a punitive measure for Americans. "

"The punitive action of the same military conflict is limited," said the professor of international law, rejecting that, in addition to punitive action, one can distinguish between a limited military conflict and a military

conflict. That is, we face two phenomena here: war and limited military confrontation. The latter is usually punitive.

War and chance of winning the Tramp in the election

Mr Bavend ultimately spoke about the potential impact of the war on his rise. Donald Trump's victory in the next US presidential election to euronews said: "We need to see the position of the House of Representatives. The majority of the House of Representatives is at the disposal of the Democrats. They should see that they will accompany a possible US war against Iran.

If the majority of Democrats meet, the situation will win the presidential election, but if there is a serious opposition, it is unclear whether Tramp's entry to the war against Iran would be his victory in the presidential election.

US action is not a solid foundation

In response to the fact that the Americans say the Revolutionary Guard has been supporting the Middle East over the past four decades, the university professor said, "This is a statement from their reasons and considerations. For example, the Americans believe that after the occupation of Iraq, the Revolutionary Guards played a role in the events that took place against American soldiers in Iraq. If those measures were working for their own internal Iraqi groups, then the Revolutionary Guards are accused of taking such action. In my opinion, in general, the reasons given by the United States for the declaration of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps are not firmly established in terms of the rules of international law.

But Americans, in any case, regard themselves as free-riders and crack down on groups that they attribute to the Quds Force or the Revolutionary Guards themselves, as they crack down on ISIL" .

The US Secretary of State, in a recent speech, apparently referring to the deaths of American soldiers in Iraq after Saddam, as well as some of the events of the 1980s in the Middle East, claimed that "the blood of American soldiers is on the hands of the Revolutionary Guards"

Global statistics

The findings of the "Global Terrorism Indicator" report indicate that 10,000 terrorist attacks were carried out in 2013, up 44 percent from 2012. The report, prepared by the Institute for Peace and Economics, says that in 2013, about 18,000 people died in terrorist attacks, of which 80% (14,722) were in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Nigeria have been sacrificed. According to the report, Iraq was the largest victim of terrorist attacks, with 6,362 victims (more than a third of the dead), and ISIL, al-Qaeda, Boko Haram and Taliban groups were responsible for most of the killings. The Syrian civil war, which began in 2011, has had the greatest impact on the increase in terrorist attacks.

Iran

In the list of countries that have seen the greatest damage from terrorism, Iran is ranked 28th after Britain and before Greece and the United States. Iran is also one of the 13 countries that the report, along with countries like Mexico and Israel, is at risk of increasing terrorist attacks.

America

According to the US Government Compensation Fund (GIYAU), from September 11, 2001 to the beginning of 2017, extremist extremists, which include a wide range of political and social groups in the United States, account for 73 percent of the deadly terrorist attacks on American soil, which in most cases are Muslims, Blacks and racial minorities were the target of these attacks.

Conclusion

Terrorism is a very difficult task. Sometimes it's impossible to find a suitable equivalent for this term. The UN Security Council, as the only authority that has the legal right to use force in international engagements, while extending its powers and responsibilities in the fight against terrorism, which is still not an endeavor of either countries that claim global responsibility In the struggle against international terrorism, it is not by

any of the institutions of this organization to provide a definite, comprehensive, and inclusive definition of international consensus.

The lack of definition of terrorism has, in fact, defined the wide range of international phenomena within the framework of terrorism and is subject to the resolutions of 1994 and 2011. In addition, the problem of separation and separation between liberation movements and terrorism remains, and leaves the hands of countries in the use of some repressive mechanisms against acts and even insurrections and internal protests. This procedure will be problematic when the Security Council's resolution on counter-terrorism in the Security Council has been approved by states to prohibit the use of force against civilians and make it part of a terrorist act. In this case, given that, according to the Secretary-General, human rights abuses are considered as examples of terrorism, the Security Council can put pressure on them or take humanitarian action against these countries.

At the same time, broad interpretation of the Security Council's resolutions on this issue can actually challenge the sovereignty of states. For example, Resolution 2011 requires United Nations Member States to design a domestic monitoring system and turn anti-terrorist activities into an internal law, as well as establish a regulatory committee to oversee the activities of governments and organizations, Which seems to have diminished the sovereignty of states in their internal affairs and placed them under institutional control. Using this resolution and its proposed committee, which now has an executive office, can be used to provide extra-structured supervision. At the same time, the government's opposition to this system or the lack of proper cooperation with it can accuse the government of protecting terrorism.

The oversight system can largely outsource the government to monitor the internal situation of the countries and if they do not cooperate, they will be among the countries that sponsor terrorism and assume penalties for them.

The resolutions that took Afghanistan from 1998 to 2001 mainly focused on the issue of terrorism and the Taliban in the context of Afghanistan and forbade them from cooperating with bin Laden. But the important point is the proposal to form a committee in paragraph 6 of resolution 1267 (1999), which states that a committee under the auspices of the United Nations Security Council should be established under Article 28 of the Special Mandate Its members include all members of the Council and its duty is described in paragraph 7. Most of these tasks include efforts to engage Member States in collecting information and taking appropriate measures to counter terrorism, and regular reports to the Council on action taken.

Although the committee has a proposed aspect in the resolution, its resolution of 2011 makes it binding and serves as a regulatory body on the work of governments. This body has binding implications and all governments have a duty to establish close contact with the committee. The new Council resolution calls on all states Quickly find the aspects of the implementation of the provisions of the resolution and submit the 90-day reports to the committee. These practical aspects should be communicated to the Anti-Terrorism Committee, in the form of a domestic law, of the means of exercising power inside and of the results of investigations.

The Counter-Terrorism Committee is trying to prevent them from cooperating or sheltering terrorists by monitoring countries. The resolution of 2011, reiterating the fight against terrorism as a threat to international peace and security, is a clear warning to countries where al-Qaeda members or individuals and institutions associated with them are displaced or supported. This includes providing weapons and military equipment, and financial and technical assistance.

However, this resolution is a surge of pressure on countries where the United States intends to shape their behavior in accordance with the new order. At the same time, it is a tool in the hands of the United States and its allies to exercise power over the countries that are somehow on their black list.

The resolution can be considered as one of the international regimes that rules its norms on the marginal actors of the international system and forces them to follow the order of the regime. The degree of intensity

and consensus governing these regimes is very high and the supervisory system that governs it is limited by the rule of sovereignty.

For example, paragraph 3 of resolution 1566 (2004) completely leaves the hands of governments and relevant institutions in providing comprehensive commentary.

This clause also allows governments to confront and suppress actions that lead to insecurity in the interior, as well as to some extent it can be used against states that are suppressing internal riots or opposition groups, and their actions Convicted and sentenced.

The pervasiveness of the UN's anti-terrorism resolutions is one of the issues that virtually contradicts the principle of the sovereignty and independence of states. Although these resolutions lack a consensus that all member states agree on, all these resolutions call on all member states to comply with their obligations in this regard. In addition, these resolutions to combat terrorism outweigh the obligations of governments from the territorial limits, and even, in some circumstances, regard interference as the international responsibility of States. For example, a US attack on a northern village in Pakistan aimed at destroying part of al-Qaeda forces, albeit a violation of a country's sovereignty and the use of force against a member of the international system and based on the resolution defining the rape of the General Assembly The United Nations in 1975, according to the judgment of the Tribunal on the Nicaragua case, is a clear indication of the act of rape, but has practically no negative reaction and is also in the fight against terrorism. In the event of a repetition of this process and its transformation into an internationally accepted procedure (whose instances are gradually increasing), one should expect the expansion of a kind of low-level war among countries that are sometimes located on ethnic, racial or religious lines. Another problem in not defining terrorism and identifying the necessary mechanisms to deal with it is the use of some sort of strategic means to suppress terrorists or groups or countries that are the subject of terrorism by others, without any concrete criteria.

In this case, many countries, such as Russia, the United States and most recently France, have described the use of nuclear weapons as a means to confront this threat. Russia even surpassed the traditional definitions of the foreign enemy, and was based on the 2000 national security document released at the height of the Chechen war. In very vague terms, the use of this weapon, even to counter domestic threats and terrorism, is unique in its own right. So nuclear weapons are re-entering the strategic literature, but this time it's a very dangerous and challenging one. This time, nuclear weapons are not a deterrent, but a preventive measure in which the threat element is punishable by deterrence and punishment before action is taken.

The dichotomy in dealing with terrorism is also one of the major dilemmas that open the hands of countries to carrying out inhumane measures, in particular genocide. While the UN Security Council has issued Resolution 1624 (2005) on this subject, the purpose of which is to request Member States to oppose and stop malicious propaganda and the drive for terrorism, and in particular actions such as genocide and oppression, as opposed to civilians But the behavior of this council with the Zionist regime is flexible. This trend was clear in the course of the 33-day war or incitement of the Gaza Strip The issue of coordinating the security policies of countries in the area of internal security, in particular the unification of information systems, border control assistance and coordinated reform of the police force, referred to in the "Secure World" report, have practically led governments to modest reforms in formal structures It is in conflict with the principle of state authority and ultimate jurisdiction of the state in the interior All of these have provided the conditions for the division of the world. Applying titles such as the civilized war against the barbaric world, naming countries that do not participate in the anti-terrorist coalition, called hostile regimes, and putting justice on them all, is a sign of new situations in which a new international order is underway. The new order needs new solutions for the maintenance of sovereignty, and in this situation it is only necessary to use rational politics.

In this context, the government can continue to play its active role in the world, which, by understanding the existing conditions, will provide appropriate strategies for action. Otherwise, the existence of countries will be at risk due to internal and external crises.

1. The existence of terrorism as a threat to national security and national security has led governments to make international interpretations motivated. Among these, one can refer to the broad interpretation of Article 51 of the United Nations, which was documented in the National Security Strategy document in 2002 as the basis for a pre-emptive and preventive strike strategy.

1. The convention was signed by 24 governments, but only the Indian government approved it.

1. In the draft comprehensive international terrorism treaty, submitted by India to the United Nations in 2000, the definition of terrorism is the same as that contained in the Geneva Convention of 1937. Paragraph 1 of Article 2 states: "The intention to take an action aimed at forcing a group of people or a government or an international organization to take or not to act"

2. Article one includes: "Any person who: a) illegally, threatens or incite to enter a plane, takes control of the aircraft, or acts like that; or (b) is the accomplice of such actions Has done "

2 The United Nations and member states and civil society should make every effort to dissuade dissident groups from resorting to or supporting terrorism. Many terrorist groups have abandoned their activities due to the loss of popular support. Therefore, it must be announced more energetically that terrorism is unjustifiable and unacceptable.

3. In the final document of the 2005 General Assembly (General Assembly resolution 60/60), the Governments welcomed the five main proposals proposed by the Secretary-General for such a strategy, agreeing that further research work on these principles and further development Find out They requested the Secretary-General to submit their proposals to the General Assembly

In response to these requests, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, with the assistance of the Special Terrorist Task Force, established in 2005 to identify the main actors in the fight against terrorism, established other affiliated organizations as well as peer organizations, including A global strategy to combat terrorism.

4- "States Parties are requested to use the 13 international instruments for the suppression and suppression of international terrorism. All member states are urged to ratify the International Covenant on International Terrorism as soon as possible. The convention should be a sign of the unity of the international community and of the United Nations' spiritual authority. All member states should implement Security Council resolutions against terrorism, in particular resolutions 1267 (1999), resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004).

References

1. President Donald Trump officially lists Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization. Voice of America
2. American Twitter Strike reaction to American Voice of America threat
3. Trump Designates Iran's Revolutionary Guard a Foreign Terrorist Group". "Trump Designates Iran's Revolutionary Guard a Foreign Terrorist Group".
4. <https://www.treasury.gov/press-center/press-releases/Pages/sm0177.aspx>
5. Pens: At the same time as supporting the Iranian people, we continue to confront the destructive behavior of the Ayatollahs
6. Mike Pumpo: The Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps is a ransom and not a Voice of America revolution
7. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgsiBmnIh0Y>
8. US Secretary of State: The Islamic Republic of Iran is certainly linked to al-Qaeda
9. Brian Hooke, in response to the Persian Voice of America's Correspondent: Corps responsible for domestic repression and tension in the region, Voice of America
10. John Bolton: Qassem Soleimani is one of the most dangerous people in the world; do not underestimate the army and the Qods Force. Voice of America

11. The reaction of a number of members of the House of Representatives to the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps in the list of terrorist groups.
12. <https://twitter.com/CENTCOMFarsi/status/1116377622760624133/photo/1>
13. «After Tight Race, Netanyahu Appears Poised to Form Israel's Next Government». NYTimes «9 April 2019. Checked in . April 2019.
14. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-saudi-bahrain-security-iran/saudi-bahrain-add-irans-revolutionary-guards-to-terrorism-lists-idUSKCN1MX288>». Saudi, Bahrain add Iran's Revolutionary Guards to terrorism lists.
15. «U.S. Designates Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a Terror Organization.