

Tyranny or care? The choice Britain must make in 2026

Published: January 12, 2026, 8:45 pm

Venezuela has become a test case for the world. If external control backed by force is allowed to stand, then sovereignty, international law, and democratic accountability all become conditional, tyranny rules and care has been consigned to history.

This video argues that Britain can no longer pretend to sit on the fence. Outside the EU, the UK must decide whether to subordinate itself to US power or recommit to Europe, multilateralism, and the defence of international law.

This is the choice of 2026. Tyranny or care. Power or principle. Silence or resistance. The cost of getting it wrong will be enormous.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=36nQwZ8Refs&si=IN7vsHN1EplH1W3t>

This is the audio version:

https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=9miyt-1a0d0f7-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&fonts=Arial&skin=f6f6f6&font-color=auto&logo_link=episode_page&btn-skin=c73a3a

This is the transcript:

Something deeply troubling happened in Venezuela on Saturday.

The US revived gunboat diplomacy, although it says it didn't.

It has revived empire, although it says it did not seek to undertake regime change in Venezuela, although it appears that it has.

It says it did not invade Venezuela, although it very obviously did.

And in the middle of all this, there's something deeply troubling going on, which is that Venezuela no longer controls its own political future, but no one is sure who does.

This matters, and let's leave Venezuela aside for the moment and the Maduro regime, because this is not a discussion of whether his government was good for the country or not, because there are plenty of reasons to be worried about that. Nor is it a discussion about the validity of that government because we know there are doubts about that, too. This is instead a discussion about how power is exercised globally and whether international law still restrains it.

The official narrative from the US is that there will be no US troops on Venezuelan soil. There is no declared occupation and no attempt, supposedly, to install a new regime; indeed, the Vice-President, Maduro's Vice-President, is now supposedly running the country.

But, that is the story we are being asked to accept, and official narratives and the truth don't always coincide, of course. The story that is not being told is that military force remains positioned offshore, just outside Venezuela, and political authority in the country is very clearly being dictated externally, with threats being used to ensure that compliance is achieved. The condition for power is now given to be consent. That is coercion; that's not diplomacy, that's not negotiation. It is just plain, straightforward, old-fashioned bullying, and that is what is going on here.

Who decides legitimacy in this case? What we knew was that there was an opposition in Venezuela. Its leader was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize only a month or two ago, but apparently, they, too, have been discarded by Trump. Apparently, they don't command sufficient support in the country to ensure that they could deliver a government, and that's not because of democratic failure; it's just because Trump has decided that it would be too inconvenient to have another Venezuelan in charge of Venezuela.

Washington has now decided it determines who is acceptable to govern Venezuela. And Washington's might has now replaced sovereignty. Venezuela has been placed under conditional authority. Power is only being held as long as instructions are followed, and policy direction is very clearly determined in Washington, whatever anybody in Venezuela now wants to say. Venezuela's independence has, as a consequence, obviously been lost. It is now colonised, whatever is being said. We might be seeing a new form of colonisation, but nonetheless, that's what's happening.

We might call this guardianship. This is rule by supervision. The claim is that one state knows better than another how the first state should be run and, therefore, backed by

the threat of force, it will impose its will on the state in question. The USA is not annexing Venezuela; it's just exerting control over it.

It's a new form of colonialism, and there are three dynamics now in play.

Violence is assumed to be persuasive.

Compliance is the overriding objective of the USA with regard to Venezuela.

And sanctions remain as the permanent threat for non-compliance.

The choice that is offered is submission or punishment.

Call it what it is, this is open thuggery.

Diplomacy has been abandoned.

Gunboat politics has returned.

And colonial power is being exercised in a modern form.

And what follows from this is abuse is not incidental; it is structural. Puppet governments always lack legitimacy, and resistance to them becomes inevitable, and that will be happening. In fact, the one thing that we can be sure that will be happening in Venezuela is that there will be opposition to whoever is now in power because they're going to satisfy no one, because they are obviously a US puppet. Everyone in opposition in Venezuela will now be united with the one goal of getting rid of any puppet government that the USA imposes on the country.

Instability is therefore being manufactured and not prevented by US action. Chaos is inevitable, as all previous US interventions in South America have shown, because that's the way they've ended.

There are bigger consequences as well.

International law is being weakened for everyone.

Smaller states are being placed on notice throughout the world.

The US targets of Cuba, Colombia, Greenland, Canada, and more are all now at risk, but so too, of course, are other countries elsewhere.

Taiwan from China.

The Baltic states from Russia, and so on.

Power is replacing rules. The world has become less safe and not more ordered right at

the start of 2026.

So, a fair question to ask is, where does this leave the UK? Britain no longer has an independent sphere of influence; we abandoned it when we left the EU. Brexit ensured this outcome, but now we must therefore exist within somebody else's sphere of influence because we have none of our own.

So we only really have two options available to us. One is alignment with Europe, and the other is subordination to the USA. There is quite literally no third path for us to choose from now. There are no hidden alternatives. We do not have a voice of our own. We are simply not a global power anymore. But there is a danger of pretence, and that is that we will still try to pretend that we do have an influence which is entirely absent, and we will claim in this situation that we cannot decide where to sit. But that indecision is itself a decision; it risks making Britain America's Trojan horse in Europe.

Our power is, in fact, drifting away, putting us at risk as a result, and who will save us now? Remember, we've been dependent before. We didn't win the Second World War single-handedly. We didn't win the First World War single-handedly. You'd think we did because of all the jingoism that goes on around these issues now. In practice, we always worked with allies, and the point is, we now have to decide, whom are we allied with?

Are we going to be allied with imperial power without restraint, and where international law is being hollowed out, and where democratic accountability is being sidelined, with Venezuela being the warning? Or are we going to openly choose Europe and recommit to multilateralism and defending international law consistently, not least by using our influence as a permanent member of the Security Council at the UN to stand up against abuse from the world powers who now exist, of the USA, China and Russia.

The fact is that Venezuela is, in this context, a test case. If the US takeover, however we describe it, of Venezuela stands, then nothing else is off limits. The real question is not what the US will do next; it is whether anyone will try to stop it.

This is a key question. The world is already a more dangerous place in the first week of 2026 than it was in 2025. That is quite an extraordinary thing to have to say, and yet it's glaringly obviously true. Despite that, in the UK, our politicians are pretending otherwise. They're pretending that we can sit and make up our minds in due course about something that is clearly wrong, that is going on, where the USA is breaching international law, using force - effectively terrorism - to subject a country to its power, and we are saying, "Let's wait and see what's going on." That is unacceptable.

The time for fence-sitting has passed. Now we must decide: are we on the side of tyranny with the USA, which will then enable the same actions from Russia and China, or are we going to stand up with other states who have already spoken out inside Europe and say, "This is unacceptable. Sovereignty must be respected. International

law must be respected. People must be respected. Care matters."

This is the choice that has to be made in 2026. It's arrived sooner than I expected, but we now must demand that our politicians decide on whose side are we, tyranny or care, the US or Europe? There is nothing else for them to decide upon. The choice is clear. Which one are they going to make? Because the cost for us of them getting it wrong will be enormous.

What do you think? There's a poll down below.

Poll

[poll id="282"]

Taking further action

If you want to write a letter to your MP on the issues raised in this blog post, there is a ChatGPT prompt to assist you in doing so, with full instructions, [**here**](#).

One word of warning, though: please ensure you have the correct MP. ChatGPT can get it wrong.

Comments

When commenting, please take note of this blog's comment policy, [**which is available here**](#). **Contravening this policy will result in comments being deleted before or after initial publication at the editor's sole discretion and without explanation being required or offered.**