

Trump's planning war crimes

Published: April 1, 2026, 6:05 am

Donald Trump has signalled his intention to attack Iran's civilian infrastructure, power stations and desalination plants, and that is a war crime under international law. The law is unambiguous: military gain does not justify targeting civilian populations and the infrastructure they depend upon, and pre-announcing an attack does not reduce culpability. This is the reality of the Iran war that the world urgently needs to confront.

The United States has not signed up to the International Criminal Court, meaning Donald Trump faces no meaningful accountability. But what is equally disturbing is the UK's role in all of this. Keir Starmer's talk of de-escalation is hollow when his government remains deeply complicit in Trump's plans. The proposed state visit by King Charles to the United States sends a message of political endorsement, not challenge. That is not diplomacy; that is complicity.

This, though, is not simply about Trump's erratic behaviour or the latest Iran news. There is a deeper ideological logic at work here, which is neoliberalism. Neoliberal economics reduces human beings to units in a system, economic cogs with conditional worth. When civilians are treated as expendable targets in a war in Iran, that is not aberration. That is the neoliberal system working as designed.

Margaret Thatcher applied the same logic to UK communities in the 1980s, treating unemployment and social harm as acceptable costs of economic policy. Trump's Iran policy is the modern expression of that same ideology, now directed at Iranian civilians on a far grander and more lethal scale. The mindset is identical; the human cost is simply larger.

The collapse of moral constraint we are witnessing in the US-Iran conflict is a systemic danger. Neoliberalism, combined with distorted justification, is overriding both international law and basic humanity, and the UK government is choosing alignment over accountability.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_N_naLsL_s4?si=NNb6QXt05yv0c4jp

This is the audio version:

https://www.podbean.com/player-v2/?i=q6c5g-1a88367-pb&from=pb6admin&share=1&download=1&rtl=0&font=Arial&skin=f6f6f6&font-color=auto&logo_link=episode_page&btn-skin=c73a3a

This is the transcript:

Donald Trump is threatening to commit war crimes. In a Truth Social post, he has signalled that he is considering possible attacks on civilian infrastructure in Iran. The targets might include power generation equipment for electricity and desalination plants, and in Iran, large parts of the country are entirely dependent upon desalinated water for the survival of their domestic populations. Civilian systems are being deliberately identified as strategic targets by Trump as a result, and his advance declaration makes his intent explicit. This is not about rhetoric alone. It is a stated policy direction, and that policy direction is explicitly illegal by definition.

International law prohibits harm to civilian populations during the course of a war. Military gain doesn't justify civilian targeting, and pre-announcing his intention will not reduce his culpability for what he is planning to do. The legal position here is unambiguous.

Despite this, accountability for Trump, for what he's planning to do looks to be unlikely. The USA has not signed up to the International Criminal Court, which could hold him to account for these crimes, any more than Israel has signed up to the same court to ensure that Benjamin Netanyahu is also held to account for what he is doing, and there are some states that will still accommodate alleged war criminals.

For example, the UK is notably weak with regard to Trump, and in my opinion, deeply complicit with what he's planning to do. A planned state visit by King Charles to the USA is signalling acceptance of Donald Trump's plans by the UK, and is not a challenge to them, and that creates political complicity in what Donald Trump is saying he plans to do.

The state visit looks as if it will confer legitimacy on his dangerous actions, and Keir Starmer is all too willing to accommodate those actions in any case. His talk about de-escalation does nothing to actually prevent these attacks from taking place. Political leaders like Starmer are choosing alignment over accountability, all of which undermines the international legal norms that have been put in place to prevent harm to civilians.

But let's just for a moment put the politics of this aside and examine the chosen behaviour that Trump is saying he's going to pursue.

What that behaviour implies is that political leaders now assume they have the permission to harm civilians. They're treating civilian harm as if it is acceptable collateral damage as a consequence of their war aims. Power is being exercised without moral constraint, and international law is increasingly being ignored in practice. This signals a deeper systemic failure in our body politic.

How did we get here? This behaviour reflects an underlying ideology, in my opinion. These aren't random actions. They're indicative of systemic thinking. They suggest that people like Trump have a worldview that permits harm for gain, and that's a logic that strips people of intrinsic value.

The ideology that is permitting this is, in my opinion, neoliberalism. Neoliberalism reduces people to being units in a system. They're treated as economic cogs in a machine. And the value of people is determined by their contribution to system outcomes. Human worth becomes conditional and expendable as a consequence within the neoliberal form of thinking, and moral consideration is replaced by economic calculus.

It is this logic that is creating the indifference to suffering that we are seeing implicit in Trump's thinking and plans, and there is a historical precedent for this, although slightly different, let's be clear. Margaret Thatcher came to power in the UK in 1979, and during the 1980s, her economic management of the UK economy showed a similar logic. Social harm was accepted as a cost of economic policy. Communities were treated as expendable in her restructuring programmes, as we saw during the 1984 Miners' Strike. Her indifference to human consequence was quite explicit.

The scale of harm differs between Margaret Thatcher and Donald Trump, but let me be clear, the mindset is comparable. Trump is a modern expression of the same logic that Margaret Thatcher had. Iranian civilians are treated as expendable targets just as unemployed people were treated as expendable by Margaret Thatcher. Trump frames war as a strategic and economic necessity, and human cost is dismissed in pursuit of those objectives. Escalation driven by political and personal motives is permitted in Donald Trump's view. The same logic as Margaret Thatcher used is being applied, but now at global scale, and there is an underlying economic agenda to all of this.

Neoliberalism prioritises wealth accumulation for a few. Costs are imposed on a wider population as if they are acceptable. Inequality is justified as a necessary outcome of the goal of increasing the wealth of a few. Suffering is reframed as a consequence, as an unavoidable trade-off, and this logic has normalised harm at scale. The ideology justifies cruelty. Harm becomes rationalised within system goals, and moral responsibility is displaced by economic reasoning. Decision makers are then insulated from the consequences of their actions, and victims are rendered invisible within this

model. This is what enables escalation without restraint at the present point in time.

So, will Trump act? We don't know. Uncertainty remains over actual military action. And Trump, as we know, is erratic and unreliable. The phrase, TACO, Trump Always Chickens Out, exists for a reason, but he has followed through before. The risk of escalation against these civilian targets is, therefore, real, and the consequences would be global and severe. We're approaching a period of systemic danger. This is not an isolated geopolitical event. It reflects a broader collapse in moral constraint. Ideology is now driving decisions that have a global impact, and the risk is extending beyond one conflict and region.

The potential for catastrophic escalation is real. Dangerous ideas are creating real threats. Neoliberalism has brought us to this point. It is the dangerous idea that has created this consequence, and it's particularly dangerous when combined with distorted religious justification for action. That has created a sense of entitlement amongst the Trump regime, which they say gives them the right to impose harm. Ideology is now overriding both law and humanity, and that is what brings societies to breaking points.

The conclusion from all of this is obvious.

This crisis is rooted in ideology and not accident.

Dehumanisation is leading directly to violence.

Political choices are now amplifying that risk, and challenging these ideas is essential; otherwise, escalation towards catastrophe becomes likely.

That's my opinion, but what do you think? There's a poll down below, but as importantly, leave a comment. We do read them. Please also like and share this video if you do indeed like it and also subscribe to our channel. That helps us with YouTube. And if you want to be practical, please leave us a donation because that helps us produce more materials like this, and they don't come cost free.

Poll

[poll id="354"]