



10



The website "Facts and Logic about the Middle East" would like to send you important news updates.

Notifications can be turned off anytime from browser settings.

Powered by VWO

No, thanks

Yes, please

# FLAME.HOTLINE

March 17, 2026



*UN Secretary General Antonio Guterres is one of many critics calling the U.S.-Israel attack on Iran illegal under international law. What he and mainstream media fail to mention is that some 75% of major wars have been illegal under vague, outdated and unenforceable international law.*

## Iran War Illegal? Accusations Show International Law Is Outdated and Unenforceable

*Word count: 1,037, estimated reading time: 3.9 minutes*

Dear Friend of Israel, Friend of FLAME:

Mainstream media pub  
without fairly stating t  
justified in bringing Ira

Fact, is, today's interna  
judgments of guilt or i

If these media were se  
admit that the U.S.-Israel alliance can legitimately be found both guilty and innocent of violating international law on their conduct of the Iran War.

Furthermore, these same media fail to identify how hopelessly outdated and manifestly unenforceable are restrictions under international law governing war in modern times.

While the U.S. and Israel's recent retaliation against Iran's years of aggressive actions are proscribed by "international law" as defined by the UN, so have the majority of military actions over the UN's last 75 years been considered *illegal*. Indeed, only three "wars" during that timeframe qualify as legal under international law.

The majority of these wars, including the current Iran War, were launched in response to egregious offenses not covered under current international law. The U.S. and Israel, for example, have called Iran's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs an "imminent, existential threat," requiring immediate preemptive strikes.

An even stronger justification for the current war is Iran's use of proxy terror groups—such as Hamas, Hezbollah and the Houthis—to attack the U.S. and Israel on Iran's behalf. The proxies' hostile strikes on both countries clearly constitute an ongoing "armed attack" and justify a military response. But such a response to indirect attacks by proxies is not currently a consideration of international laws on war, and thus the U.S. and Israel's retaliation isn't considered "legal" by some analysts.

Perhaps most important when judging the validity of laws against wars is the reality that laws without enforcement mechanisms are effectively not laws at all—just empty words.

While many Western nations still cling to the illusion of an international order binding the world's political fabric, the failure of international laws to govern war and punish violators illustrates the façade of that belief. Short of an overhaul of these laws, the world is stuck with justice in contentious world affairs being meted out by winners of lawless wars.

**Mainstream media provide one-sided view of international law.** For instance, *Guardian* columnist Kenneth Roth blasted Israel and the U.S. for attacking Iran without approval from the UN Security Council (UNSC) or the existence of an imminent threat. A column in *New Yorker* magazine presented a similar argument.

What many mainstream media don't mention, however, is that international law, specifically Article 51 of the UN Charter, gives countries the right to self-defense. Since Iran's nuclear program *does* present an imminent threat, the two countries *are* justified in launching their attack.

**International law is ambiguous, obsolete and unenforceable.** Legacy media don't consider that it's impossible to objectively judge guilt or innocence in the context of violating international law—especially by biased commentators, which most are. Indeed, while critics can argue that the U.S. and Israel undermined Iran's territorial integrity and political independence without justification or UNSC approval, supporters can also argue that the two allies were justified because of the imminent threat posed by Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile programs and that their attack on Iran was an act of self-defense.



The website "Facts and Logic about the Middle East" would like to send you important news updates.

Notifications can be turned off anytime from browser settings.

Powered by VWO

al war against Iran  
(and morally)

permit dispositive

Israel—they would

Mainstream media also... much of it was made b... Furthermore, internati... necessary tools to enfo... Russia, the U.S., UK or



**The website “Facts and Logic about the Middle East” would like to send you important news updates.**

Notifications can be turned off anytime from browser settings.

Powered by VWO

al law is. After all, cyberwarfare. body having the etoed by China,

**Most wars over the las**

1956 Suez Canal Crisis, when the UK, France and Israel invaded Egypt without UN approval, and the 2003 Iraq War, when the U.S. invaded Iraq without UN approval, under the false pretext of preventing the use of weapons of mass destruction.

iddle East, such as the

In fact, in the last 75 years, only three major wars fully complied with international law: The Korean War (1950-53), when the UNSC authorized military force in response to North Korea’s invasion of South Korea; the Gulf War (1991), when the UNSC authorized force to expel Iraq from Kuwait, and in Libya (2011), when the UNSC authorized a no-fly zone to protect civilians. In recent years, however, legacy media hold “international law” as sacrosanct if it offers a way to condemn Israel and the U.S. for violating it.

**What is an “imminent” threat?** Some, like *Guardian* columnist Kenneth Roth, suggest U.S.-Israeli attacks on Iran were unjustified because there was no imminent threat. Likewise, a column in *Conversation* argued, “preventive war has no legal basis under international law”—as if to say, unless Iranian nuclear missiles are in the air, heading for the U.S. or Israel, neither country is justified in retaliating. In such a case, neither Israel nor the U.S. could afford to abide by international law—doing so would be suicidal. Tragically, international law doesn’t provide clear guidelines on what is an imminent threat worthy of a pre-emptive strike.

**International law doesn’t consider indirect attacks by proxies.** Iranian terrorist proxy militias— Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis—have attacked the U.S. and Israel for decades, murdering hundreds of innocent Israelis and Americans. The two countries have responded in self-defense to many of these attacks, but since international law doesn’t take proxies into consideration, these defensive actions can technically be called illegal, especially by anti-Western media.

**International law restricting war rings hollow**, because it is unenforceable. Furthermore, it doesn’t address the realities that characterize modern conflicts. But this doesn’t stop mainstream media or other haters from condemning Israel or the U.S. for taking sensible, urgent actions to defend themselves.

Please make the point when speaking with family, friends, colleagues—or in letters to the editor—that by criticizing the U.S. and Israel for violating international laws—without addressing the thorny issues that plague these laws—mainstream media are negligent, demonstrating flagrant, irresponsible bias.

If you agree we need to spread this truth, please use your email browser to forward this Hotline issue to fellow lovers of Israel—and encourage them to join us by subscribing to the Hotline at no charge.

Best regards,  
James Sinkinson, President  
Facts and Logic About the Middle East (FLAME)

P.S. Surely you’ve recently read of some celebrity, politician, radical student, foreign head of state or media pundit slander Israel with the “Gaza genocide” lie. Many who spread this lie are ignorant, but most are anti-Israel haters. They care nothing for the truth. The tragedy is, when they utter the Gaza genocide falsehood, too few knowledgeable people—and virtually no media—stand up to refute it. Indeed, when you

share the simple facts, terrorists with the high genocide—fair-minded Israel-U.S. relationship **Gaza Genocide Lies**—c war are ethical and rig Gaza is actually increas



**The website “Facts and Logic about the Middle East” would like to send you important news updates.**

Notifications can be turned off anytime from browser settings.

Powered by VWO

its war against Hamas s the definition of e supporters of the ge—“**Facts Shatter** Israel’s tactics in the estinian population in lie fit the classic

definition of antisemites. Please review this convincing, fact-based editorial, which FLAME is about to publish to millions—in leading social media, as well as in the *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Post*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Tampa Bay Times*, *Denver Post* and *Los Angeles Times*. This piece will also be sent to all members of Congress, the President and Vice President. If you agree that this kind of public relations effort on Israel’s behalf is critical, I urge you to **support us** with a donation.

