

## Dragged into the Fire? Starmer Sides with Trump on Iran as War Looms

In a moment that has shocked many at home and abroad, UK Prime Minister Keir Starmer has thrown his political weight behind Donald Trump's controversial airstrikes on Iran's nuclear facilities. Echoing the former U.S. President's hardline stance, Starmer declared that Iran "must never be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon," aligning Britain with Washington at a time when tensions in the Middle East are rapidly spiraling out of control. While Starmer stopped short of endorsing further military action, he confirmed that the UK was informed ahead of time, a move that has sparked growing fears Britain may be sliding into war by proxy, without open debate or parliamentary approval.

Starmer's message was carefully worded. He emphasized the need to prevent nuclear proliferation while simultaneously urging caution to avoid a wider regional conflict. Yet the optics were clear: Britain stands with the U.S., even as Iran vows revenge and missiles rain down across Israel. The UK convened emergency COBRA meetings and reached out to allies in Oman and Jordan, suggesting the threat of escalation isn't hypothetical; it's already in motion. The fear in Whitehall isn't just about war in the Middle East, it's about war following us home.

Political reaction in the UK has been deeply divided. Labour's Emily Thornberry blasted the strikes as "reckless," warning they risk turning a dangerous standoff into an uncontrollable regional inferno. Green MP Adrian Ramsay echoed those concerns, accusing the government of abandoning diplomacy in favor of military posturing. Foreign Secretary David Lammy struck a more measured tone, calling for a "diplomatic solution" to the crisis, even as his prime minister lent support to the bombing campaign. Meanwhile, Conservative MPs wasted no time backing Starmer, praising his resolve and warning of the threat posed by a nuclear Iran.

But beyond political spin lies a deeper concern: was Britain complicit? The government insists it did not take part in the strikes, but critics are now demanding full transparency over whether UK bases, like Diego Garcia or RAF Akrotiri, were involved in any way. The legal and ethical implications are serious. If Britain was even indirectly involved, why wasn't Parliament consulted?

As Iran threatens to shut down vital oil routes and Trump hints at regime change, Starmer's position has put the UK in the eye of a geopolitical storm. And many are now asking: Is this leadership, or sleepwalking into someone else's war?