

Behind the Scenes of Neutrality!

Question:

What lies behind the support of the Arab countries on the southern shores of the Persian Gulf for the U.S. and Israeli attack on Iran?



For years, officials of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, in their official discourse, spoke of neutrality toward Iran and defined disagreements within the framework of regional competition. But the recent Associated Press report has lifted the curtain on an intention that had previously been expressed only in private circles and behind closed doors: the open desire to overthrow the system of the Islamic Republic of Iran. This report, published citing American, Israeli, and Arab officials, shows that what had previously been hidden has now become public because of the opportunity created by the war. Under such circumstances, the main issue is how the coalition Iran is facing and what the natural right of defense against this open aggression should be explained.

The Associated Press report is of decisive importance in this regard because it explicitly exposes, in the words of Saudi and Emirati officials, their desire to fundamentally weaken the system of the Islamic Republic. According to this report, a diplomat from the Persian Gulf littoral countries stated that Saudi Arabia and the UAE are at the forefront of calls to increase military pressure on Tehran. It is also reported, citing an informed source, that Mohammed bin Salman, the Saudi Crown Prince, told White House officials: "Further weakening Iran's military capability and its clerical leadership is in the long-term

interests of the Persian Gulf region and beyond."

These sentences go beyond an ordinary political position. When the Saudi Crown Prince speaks of Iran's "clerical leadership" and identifies it as a target for weakening, it means that the main intention is not a change in behavior, but a change in the structure of power in Iran. The phrase "completely and permanently disabling clerical rule in Iran," which appears in the report, shows that the goal goes beyond limiting Iran's missile program or regional influence and is defined in the direction of regime change.

The more important point is that the report states that officials from Saudi Arabia, the UAE, Kuwait, and Bahrain said in private conversations that they "do not want military operations to end until significant changes occur in Iran's leadership or a major change takes place in Iran's behavior." This phrase reveals two fundamental points: first, these countries not only support the U.S. and Israeli aggression, but also want it to continue until the final result is achieved. Second, changing Iran's behavior is not enough for them, and they have defined change in Iran's leadership as the ultimate goal.

With this intention now exposed, the true face of the coalition confronting Iran becomes clear. What had previously been

defined as regional competition or political disagreements among neighboring countries has now revealed itself as an aggressive coalition, with America and Israel at its head, and Saudi Arabia and the UAE alongside them as political and strategic supporters of the continuation of the war, seeking the continuation of aggression until the overthrow of the system of the Islamic Republic.

This reality places the issue of Iran's defense in a framework completely different from ordinary regional rivalries. When a country is subjected to military aggression by transregional powers and its neighbors also openly support the continuation of that aggression until the overthrow of that country's political system, this situation can no longer be defined within the framework of ordinary diplomatic disputes. This is precisely an example of hybrid aggression, in which both the direct actor of aggression and its political supporters pursue a common objective.

Iran's right to defend itself against this aggression is not a political right, but a fundamental and natural right. International law and the United Nations Charter recognize legitimate defense against aggression for all countries. But beyond legal requirements, when a country faces a coalition that openly seeks to overthrow its system, any hesitation in defending itself would mean not only the loss of

sovereignty, but also endangering national existence.

The important point is that the Associated Press report shows this desire for overthrow is so explicit that it has even moved beyond the confidential framework and has become the language of senior Saudi and Emirati officials in conversation with the White House. Mohammed bin Salman, who once spoke of dialogue with Iran, now tells American officials that weakening Iran's clerical leadership is in the interests of the region. This change in tone is a sign that the curtain has been lifted from an intention that had previously been hidden behind diplomatic phrases.

Under such circumstances, Iran's unified defense, within the natural right of defense against the aggressive coalition, is not a choice but a strategic necessity. The U.S. and Israeli aggression alone is enough to justify legitimate defense. But when neighbors who for years claimed neutrality or the resolution of disagreements through diplomacy openly stand in the ranks of the aggressors and call for the continuation of the war until the overthrow of Iran's system, the nature of the threat becomes completely different. Iran is not facing a limited military operation, but a regional project to change the structure of power, and defense against it is defense of sovereignty, territorial integrity, and national independence.