PERMANENT MISSION OF THE
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

نمایندگی دائم جمهوری اسلامی ایران
نزد سازمان ملل متحد

In the Name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful

No. 2850030 18 March 2026

Excellency,

I have the honour to transmit herewith, as attached, the legal position of the Islamic Republic of Iran regarding United Nations Security Council resolution 2817 (2026), adopted on 12 March 2026 in a manner that is manifestly unjust, legally untenable, and fundamentally divorced from the factual and legal realities of the situation.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its attachment circulated as an official document of the Security Council and of the General Assembly under agenda item 84, entitled "The Rule of Law at the National and International Levels."

Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of our highest consideration.

Amir Saeid Iravani
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

H.E. Mr. António Guterres
Secretary-General
United Nations, New York

H.E. Mr. Michael G. Waltz
President of the Security Council
United Nations, New York

H.E. Ms. Annalena Baerbock
President of the General Assembly
United Nations, New York

622 THIRD AVE, 34TH FL, NEW YORK, NY 10017 PHONE: +1 (212) 687 - 2020 EMAIL: IRANUNNY@MFA.GOV.IR WEBSITE: NY.MFA.GOV.IR

PERMANENT MISSION OF THE
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
TO THE UNITED NATIONS

نمایندگی دائم جمهوری اسلامی ایران
نزد سازمان ملل متحد

Legal Position of the Islamic Republic of Iran

on UN Security Council Resolution 2817 (2026)

The Islamic Republic of Iran has been the target and victim of a blatant act of aggression perpetrated by the United States and the Israeli regime since 28 February 2026. In the exercise of its inherent right of self-defence enshrined in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, Iran has taken necessary and proportionate measures to defend its sovereignty, territorial integrity, and people. Yet, in a deeply troubling and indefensible development, the Security Council, in willful disregard of this act of aggression and the ongoing war imposed upon Iran, proceeded on 12 March 2026 to adopt resolution 2817—an action that starkly exposes a grave failure to uphold its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

United Nations Security Council resolution 2817 (2026) is manifestly unjust, legally untenable, and fundamentally detached from reality. It grossly distorts the factual and legal context by willfully ignoring the ongoing war of aggression launched against the Islamic Republic of Iran by the United States and the Israeli regime—an aggression openly admitted by their own highest officials. In doing so, the resolution denies Iran its inherent and inalienable right of self-defence, as reaffirmed by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in direct contravention of the Charter itself. By omitting any reference to the perpetrators of this act of aggression, the resolution not only abdicates the Security Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, but also risks legitimising and emboldening continued acts of aggression. The sustained military attacks against Iran—targeting civilian populations and critical infrastructure—have already risen to the level of the crime of aggression and war crimes under international law. Resolution 2817 (2026) is entirely one-sided, biased, and indefensible. It portrays Iran's lawful and necessary acts of self-defence as if they occurred in a vacuum, severed from the context of the preceding and ongoing aggression. The Security Council has failed to acknowledge even the most basic causal link between the unlawful attacks by the United States and the Israeli regime and the defensive measures undertaken by Iran. Even more striking is the deliberate omission of any reference to the United States or the Israeli regime in the text of the resolution—an omission that underscores its selective, politicised, and profoundly unbalanced nature.

Turning to the littoral States of the Persian Gulf, if they had not permitted their territories to be used by United States military forces for acts of aggression, U.S. military bases and facilities in the region would not have become lawful targets under the applicable rules of international law. Regrettably, both the littoral States concerned and the Security Council have thus far chosen to disregard these clear and undeniable realities. This is despite the Islamic Republic of Iran consistently reaffirming its commitment to the principles of mutual respect, sovereignty, and good-neighbourliness.

622 THIRD AVE, 34TH FL, NEW YORK, NY 10017 PHONE: +1 (212) 687 - 2020 EMAIL: IRANUNNY@MFA.GOV.IR WEBSITE: NY.MFA.GOV.IR

Notwithstanding its broad authority under the Charter with respect to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Security Council has conspicuously failed to recommend any terms of settlement prior to the escalation of this situation, thereby neglecting its responsibility to prevent the deterioration of international peace and security. Moreover, the Security Council has refrained from making any determination as to the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression in connection with the joint act of aggression carried out by the United States and the Israeli regime against the Islamic Republic of Iran. This omission reflects a profound abdication of its duties under the Charter and further underscores the selective and politicised nature of its response.

The Security Council's selective and manifestly biased stance in the ongoing conflict is unmistakable. It has chosen to reiterate its strong support for the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of the littoral States of the Persian Gulf and Jordan, while conspicuously omitting any reference to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Such deliberate exclusion lays bare a troubling reality: the Security Council has willfully sidelined the legitimate rights and interests of Iran for political interests and under the weight of external pressures.

Equally indefensible is the resolution's purported emphasis on the protection of civilians and civilian objects. This concern is applied in a wholly selective manner, disregarding the killing of thousands of innocent Iranian civilians and the widespread destruction of civilian infrastructure resulting from the unlawful military actions of the United States and the Israeli regime. The result is a deeply distorted application of international humanitarian law, creating an impression that its fundamental principles are not invoked universally—excluding, for instance, the protection of the Iranian people.

The Security Council's failure to unequivocally condemn the deliberate targeting of civilians and civilian objects within the Islamic Republic of Iran by the United States and the Israeli regime is not only indefensible but also against humanity. These unlawful attacks have struck airports, energy installations, and other critical civilian infrastructure, as well as hospitals, schools, residential areas, and cultural and historical sites, resulting in the martyrdom of thousands of civilians and the injury of many more. Such silence in the face of grave violations of international humanitarian law is a shame for the Security Council and erodes the credibility of the Council itself.

Equally flawed is the Council's demand for the cessation of Iran's actions against certain littoral States of the Persian Gulf, a demand premised on a fundamentally distorted and misleading narrative. In the lawful exercise of its inherent right of self-defence, the Islamic Republic of Iran has targeted specific United States military bases and facilities situated within those States from which the war crimes against Iranians are being perpetrated. These locations have been used as

operational platforms for acts of aggression against Iran, with the full knowledge and consent of the host States, which have effectively placed their territories at the disposal of the United States and the Israeli regime. Under such circumstances, the consequences arising from the use of their territory for unlawful armed attacks cannot be divorced from their own responsibility.

Resolution 2817 (2026) is striking not only for what it includes, but for what it deliberately omits. It fails to make even the most general reference—let alone a substantive one—to the obligation of all Member States to refrain from the threat or use of force in international relations. By omitting any reference to Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council has consciously disregarded one of the most fundamental and peremptory principles of international law. This omission is neither accidental nor insignificant; it underscores that the Council's decision is detached from the very legal framework it is mandated to uphold, and therefore cannot be regarded as grounded in the principles of justice and international law. It is particularly revealing that the initial drafts of the resolution did contain references to these core legal obligations, which were subsequently removed as a result of bullying and pressure from one of the principal aggressors, namely the United States. This deliberate dilution further exposes the politicised nature of the final text and calls into question the integrity of the Council's decision-making process.

Pursuant to United Nations General Assembly resolution 3314 (XXIX) of 14 December 1974, any of a series of enumerated acts—regardless of a formal declaration of war—constitutes an act of aggression. Yet the Security Council has manifestly failed to acknowledge or address clear instances that fall squarely within this definition. These include the direct attack by the armed forces of the United States and the Israeli regime against the Islamic Republic of Iran, as well as the bombardment of its territory.

Moreover, the actions of Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Oman—in permitting their territories to be used by the United States and the Israeli regime as operational platforms for launching armed attacks against Iran- engage serious legal consequences. By placing their territory at the disposal of the aggressors, these States have, at a minimum, facilitated acts that qualify as aggression within the meaning of resolution 3314. As such, they have become, directly or indirectly, implicated in the conflict and cannot reasonably claim insulation from the legal and factual consequences arising from Iran's lawful exercise of its right of self-defence. Absent the establishment and use of such military bases and facilities within their territories for hostile operations against Iran, the present situation—and the necessity for responsive defensive measures—would not have arisen.

In light of the foregoing failures and omissions in resolution 2817 (2026), it is imperative to recall that, under international law, the Security Council is bound to exercise its authority in full conformity with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Any departure

from these foundational standards fundamentally undermines the legal validity and moral authority of its decisions.

Furthermore, the well-established principle of *ex injuria jus non oritur*—that law cannot arise from injustice—squarely applies in the present circumstances. Acts or decisions tainted by illegality, selectivity, or political manipulation cannot generate legitimate legal consequences. Viewed through the *ex injuria* principle, resolution 2817, having been adopted in disregard of core Charter principles and in the context of an unaddressed act of aggression, lacks the necessary legal foundation to impose binding obligations on the Islamic Republic of Iran.

In accordance with the well-established principle of *nemo plus iuris ad alium transferre potest*—that no one can transfer to another more rights than they themselves possess—the Security Council lacks the authority to affirm or endorse any purported right of the littoral States of the Persian Gulf to exercise individual or collective self-defence in response to the lawful actions of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Iran's measures are grounded in its inherent and Charter-recognised right of self-defence against acts of aggression perpetrated by the United States, the Israeli regime, and those States whose territories have been placed at the disposal of the aggressors.

The jurisprudence of the principal organs of international law reinforces the limitations on the Security Council's authority and underscores its binding obligations under the Charter. In its 1971 *Namibia* Advisory Opinion[1], the International Court of Justice (ICJ) affirmed that: "One of the fundamental principles governing the international relationship thus established is that a party which disowns or does not fulfil its own obligations cannot be recognised as retaining the rights which it claims to derive from the relationship." Similarly, in its 1948 Advisory Opinion on the *Admission of a State to the United Nations*[2], the ICJ emphasised that: "The political character of an organ cannot release it from the observance of the treaty provisions established by the Charter when they constitute limitations on its powers or criteria for its judgment." This principle has been echoed by the Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in the 1995 *Tadić* Judgment, which declared: "Neither the text nor the spirit of the Charter conceives of the Security Council as *legibus solutus* (unbound by law)."

Collectively, these authoritative rulings underscore that the Security Council, regardless of its political composition or powers, remains fully bound by the Charter and cannot act in disregard of fundamental legal obligations, including the prohibition on the unlawful use of force and the rights of States to self-defence. As this has also been reaffirmed by Article 25 of the UN Charter, one can say that Resolution 2817 is against the letter and spirit of the Charter of the United Nations.

---

[1] Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 16.
[2] Admission of a State to the United Nations (Charter, Art. 4), Advisory Opinion: I.C.J. Reports 1948, p. 57.

In sum, the adoption of resolution 2817 represents a profound blow to the credibility of the Security Council, leaving an indelible mark on its record, tainted by the political agendas of certain members. History will remember these decisions as a stark demonstration of manifest injustice and a deeply selective approach—disregarding the protection of human life, the rights of Member States, and the core norms of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*. More broadly, it constitutes a troubling departure from the fundamental principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, principles the Council is entrusted to uphold.