

IRAN-US Tensions Rise at UN Following US Attack

Al-Mesa

By Spencer Morgan

January 12, 2020

The US and the Republic of Iran faced off for the first time since the U.S. assassinated Irani General Soleimani at the General Assembly this week. A resolution condemning the unilateral action was submitted for consideration while the US claimed its actions were taken in self-defense -- authorized under Article 51 of the UN Charter. Neither side seems eager to give the other the last word.

The U.S. killed General Qassem Soleimani in an airstrike conducted while the General was in Baghdad on December 29th. The Lebanese Republic sponsored a resolution condemning the action in the General Assembly on Thursday. The Resolution is cosponsored by the Republics of Syria and Iraq. Iran's Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif was unable to attend the session in New York as the U.S. refused to provide him a visa.

On Jan 8th, Iran retaliated for Soleimani's death by firing missiles at military facilities housing U.S. troops in Iraq. U.S. President, Donald Trump previously issued a statement denying any casualties, however according to the Washington Post, eight U.S. soldiers were treated for concussions following the bombing.

Both sides are providing mixed signals about their next moves. While the Supreme leader said the bombing was a proportional conclusion to the situation, Esmail Qaani, Gen. Soleimani's successor as commander of the Quds Force of the Revolutionary Guard, declared that Iran will hit its "enemy in a manly fashion". In a letter to the U.N. Security Council, U.S. Ambassador Kelly Craft said the U.S. stands "ready to engage without preconditions in serious negotiations with Iran, with the goal of preventing further endangerment of international peace and security or escalation by the Iranian regime. . . [but are] . . . prepared to take additional actions in the region, as necessary, to continue to protect U.S. personnel and interests."

Commented [SM(1): Ordered Pairs – Order of priority in listing provides subtle, subconscious hint of preference

Commented [SM(2): Using modifiers or more aggressive verbs/adverbs can provide bias without changing or omitting facts.

Commented [SM(3): Feigned "both-side"-ism provides the reader with a false sense of unbiasedness.

Commented [SM(4): Juxtaposing reasonable responses next to petty or violent actions colors the readers view of a disfavored party.

Commented [SM(5): Ending a paragraph about the negative actions of a favored party with an embarrassing line about a disfavored party helps the reader keep their attention on the negative actions of the disfavored party.

Commented [SM(6): Use "false moral equivalence" to excuse threats or violent action by a favored party by comparing it to the actions of a disfavored party as though they are of equal moral repugnance.