

Syria

Published: January 14, 2026, 4:36 am

I wrote this last night:

Sometimes I struggle. Some would say that was obvious. But what I mean is that sometimes I really struggle to understand something that is, apparently, obvious.

For example, our Cabinet apparently find it obvious that action should be taken over Syria. I cannot find a reason why they think that.

It's not yet clear what happened in Syria. I think it might be wise to find out.

And it might equally be wise to learn from previous gung-ho interventions. Need I list them all, down to the last laser guided missile? I doubt it. Instead, simply ask what problem was solved by such gestures?

Was Libya?

Or Iraq?

Don't mention Afghanistan.

Or ask whether the situation in Syria been solved by any previous intervention?

And if intervention is to happen, what for?

Regime change? Who, then, is the replacement to Assad?

To let establish a new government? What's our success rate?

And why should we choose?

Of course the Assad regime is deeply repugnant. I agree, entirely. And the use of chemical weapons is abhorrent. But the first rule has to be, do no more harm.

I can see no way we can in any way hope to meet that rule.

In that case I struggle as to why we should intervene because we add nothing for anyone by doing so that I can see.

I write this to simply register my protest at the folly of a bunch of people who I do not trust and who so lack faith in us, the people of the U.K., that they will not ask parliament to approve their actions.

All I do understand is that in my opinion unlawful killing might be too kind a description of their actions if they were to attack in that case. And for that there should be consequences.