

世界需要国际法，而非丛林法则

随着美国和以色列对伊朗发动大规模军事打击，各国政府与国际组织的反应呈现出尖锐对立。部分声音表示支持，另一些则予以谴责，还有多方呼吁保持克制。这些反应并非简单地按照东西方阵营或意识形态划线。若透过国际法而非单纯地缘政治的棱镜来观察，这些官方表态实则暴露出各方对“基于规则的国际秩序”内涵存在更深层次的分歧。

在剖析全球反应之前，我们必须先审视这些打击行动本身的合法性。根据华盛顿和特拉维夫的声明，此次行动旨在保护公民、消除伊朗的核与导弹能力、针对高层领导层，并通过削弱政府来推动所谓的“民主”变革。从战略层面看，这些目标或许能在其盟友中引发共鸣。然而从法律角度审视，这些理由如同流沙般站不住脚。依据国际法，上述任何一项都构不成动用武力的合法依据。

《联合国宪章》第二条第四款明确规定，禁止威胁或使用武力侵犯任何国家的领土完整或政治独立，这是现代国际法的基石。此规则仅有两个公认的例外：联合国安理会的授权，或依据《宪章》第五十一条进行的合法自卫。

此次袭击并未获得联合国安理会授权。因此，唯一可能的法律依据将是自卫权。然而伊朗并未对美国发动武装攻击，且当前局势亦不符合“卡罗琳原则”所体现的习惯国际法标准——该原则要求自卫行为必须具有“即时性、压倒性且别无选择”的必要性。所谓“预防性自卫”或更广泛的安全关

切主张，尚未在国际法中获得普遍认可。基于此，美国与以色列的军事行动违反国际法的结论难以回避。

若此类理由被广泛接受，任何国家都可在自认受到威胁时援引类似逻辑使武力使用合法化。这将导致国际社会重返弱肉强食的丛林法则，最终由强权而非法律决定国际事务走向。所谓“基于规则的国际秩序”公信力将遭到根本性破坏。

在此法律框架下，国际社会的不同反应呈现出几种地缘政治立场分野。

一小部分国家虽数量不多但值得关注，它们直接将此次袭击称为违法行为。俄罗斯称此次行动是对联合国主权成员国的一次武装侵略。中国表示，袭击并杀害伊朗最高领导人严重侵犯伊朗主权和安全，践踏《联合国宪章》的宗旨和原则以及国际关系基本准则。挪威明确反对“先发制人”的说法，强调此种行动需要有迫在眉睫的威胁。这些立场之所以引人注目，是因为它们用严格的法律而非纯粹的政治术语来定义这场危机。

另一些国家试图通过在法律原则上正式保持平衡立场，同时谴责最初的袭击和伊朗随后的报复行动。马来西亚批评美以袭击侵犯主权，同时对地区局势升级表示深切关注。西班牙也附和了这一说法，呼吁各方充分尊重国际法，拒绝任何一方的单方面军事行动。

西方国家集团则几乎完全聚焦于批评伊朗的反击，巧妙地回避了最初打击的合法性问题。英国、法国和德国强调遏制德黑兰核野心的必要性，而数个海湾国家则谴责伊朗的报

复行为破坏了地区稳定。尽管援引了维护稳定的原则，这些国家在策略上避而不谈对美以行动的质疑。

与此同时，加拿大和澳大利亚等美国的盟友公开声援华盛顿的行动，将此次打击描绘为全球安全的必要之举，却未提及《联合国宪章》的具体法律依据。印度等国则选择了不同的路径，强调尊重主权并呼吁恢复对话，并未明确作出法律层面的评判。



总而言之，这些反应表明，对国际法的维护仍然令人沮丧地参差不齐。各国的立场常常因战略利益、联盟结构和区域考量而遭到扭曲。然而，在这些外交手段之下，隐藏着国际社会一个关乎存亡的问题：禁止使用武力是否仍是国际体系的基石？

国际法不能像自助菜单一样，被选择性地用来惩罚对手，而在保护盟友时却被忽视。如果允许强国根据自己的战略利

益随时改写使用武力的规则，那么二战后使世界保持相对稳定的规范框架将会崩溃。在一个强权即公理的体系中，中小国家将首当其冲。

对基于规则的真正承诺需要保持一致性，但欧洲国家和美国的某些盟国却串通一气，没能履行这一承诺。危机时刻，地缘政治考量不可避免地主宰公众舆论。然而，恰恰是在这种高风险时刻，遵守国际法才最重要。否则，在一个法律约束向单边武力彻底让步的世界里，所有国家的安全最终都将面临危险。

本篇英文版：Following the large-scale military strikes launched by the United States and Israel against Iran, reactions from governments and international organizations have been sharply divided. Some voiced support, others issued condemnation, and many called for restraint. These responses do not fall neatly along a simple East-West or ideological divide. Viewed through the lens of international law rather than geopolitics alone, these official statements reveal deeper differences over the meaning of a rules-based international order.

Before dissecting the global reaction, we must address the legality of the strikes themselves. According to statements from Washington and Tel Aviv, the operation was designed to protect citizens, neutralize Iran's nuclear and missile capabilities, target

senior leadership, and weaken the government to foster "democratic" change. Strategically, these goals may resonate with their allies. Legally, however, they stand on shifting sand. Under international law, none of these objectives constitutes a lawful basis for the use of military force.

The governing standard is Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, the very cornerstone of modern international law. It explicitly prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. There are only two recognized exceptions to this rule: authorization by the UN Security Council, or lawful self-defense under Article 51.

The strikes were not authorized by the UN Security Council. Therefore, the sole possible legal justification would be self-defense. Yet Iran did not launch an armed attack against the United States. Nor do the circumstances satisfy the customary international law criteria reflected in the Caroline doctrine, which requires necessity to be instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means. Claims of "preventive self-defense" or broader security concerns have not gained general acceptance in international law. On this basis, the conclusion that the US-Israeli military action violated international law is difficult to avoid.

If such justifications were widely accepted, any state could invoke similar reasoning to legitimize the use of force whenever

it perceives a threat. The result would be a return to a law-of-the-jungle mentality in which power, rather than law, determines outcomes. The credibility of the so-called rules-based international order would be fundamentally undermined.

Against this legal backdrop, the international community's varied responses reveal several distinct geopolitical postures.

A small but notable group of countries directly called out the strikes as legal violations. Russia described the operation as an act of armed aggression against a sovereign UN member state. China took the position that the attack and killing of Iran's supreme leader constituted a serious violation of Iran's sovereignty and security, trampling on the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the basic norms governing international relations. Norway explicitly rejected the "pre-emptive" label, emphasizing that such action requires an imminent threat. These positions stand out because they frame the crisis in strict legal terms rather than solely political ones.

Other nations sought to maintain a formally balanced position grounded in legal principles by condemning both the initial strikes and Iran's subsequent retaliation. Malaysia criticized the US-Israeli attacks as violations of sovereignty while expressing deep concern over regional escalation. Spain

echoed this, calling for full respect of international law and rejecting unilateral military actions from any side.

Conversely, a bloc of Western states focused their criticism almost entirely on Iran's response, neatly sidestepping the legality of the initial strikes. The UK, France, and Germany emphasized the need to curb Tehran's nuclear ambitions, while several Gulf states condemned Iran's retaliatory actions as regional violations. While invoking principles of stability, they strategically avoided questioning the US-Israeli operation.

Finally, some US allies — including Canada and Australia — openly cheered Washington's actions, framing the strikes as necessary for global security without addressing the specific legal basis under the UN Charter. Nations like India took a different route, emphasizing respect for sovereignty and urging a return to dialogue without making explicit legal determinations.

Taken together, these reactions demonstrate that the defense of international law remains frustratingly uneven. States' positions are routinely warped by strategic interests, alliance structures, and regional calculations. Yet, beneath these diplomatic maneuvers lies an existential question for the global community: Does the prohibition on the use of force remain the bedrock of the international system?

International law cannot function as an à la carte menu, invoked selectively to punish adversaries and ignored to protect allies. If powerful states are permitted to rewrite the rules governing the use of force whenever it suits their strategic interests, the normative framework that has kept the world relatively stable since 1945 will collapse. Smaller and medium-sized states will be the first to suffer in a system where might makes right.

A genuine commitment to a rules-based international order requires consistency — something European states and certain US allies, through their complicity, have failed to uphold. In moments of crisis, geopolitical calculations inevitably dominate public discourse. Yet it is precisely in these high-stakes moments that adherence to international law matters most. The alternative is a world where legal restraints give way to unilateral force — a trajectory that will ultimately imperil the security of all nations.