Dear [MP NAME],

I am writing to express my absolute outrage and disgust at the government's response to the ongoing US and Israeli attacks on Iran, and in particular at Keir Starmer's decision to permit the United States to use British bases to conduct further strikes. Please note from the outset, however, that I am not politely requesting clarification or justification. There can be none. I am demanding accountability from a government claiming to represent me even as it appears determined to drag the United Kingdom into yet another catastrophic war in the Middle East by facilitating what is quite plainly unlawful military action.

The strikes carried out by the United States and Israel against Iran represent a significant use of armed force against a sovereign state. Under Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, such force is prohibited unless it meets the exceptionally narrow criteria for self-defence under Article 51, namely, that an armed attack has occurred and that response is necessary and proportionate. On any sober reading of the available facts, that threshold has not been met. By permitting UK bases to be used in support of these strikes, the British government is making itself a potential co-participant in acts of aggression. If these strikes are later found to be unlawful, the UK will share complicity. The government's refusal to publish its own legal advice suggests it knows this perfectly well.

I am also disgusted, though not surprised, by the abrogation of moral responsibility on display. Reports indicate that an Israeli missile struck a school in Iran, killing more than 150 people, most of them schoolgirls under the age of 13. Even allowing for the fog of war and the need for independent verification, the scale of reported child casualties is horrifying. And yet the Prime Minister's public statements have framed this crisis almost entirely around Iran being in the wrong. He has permitted the use of UK bases after Iran's retaliation, as though that retaliation were the origin of the crisis, rather than a response to being attacked first. This is not only a misleading framing, but a deliberate and cynical rewriting of events designed to manufacture consent for further escalation. We have seen this from Starmer before in relation to the US and Israeli attacks on Iran last year and the Israeli attacks on Hezbollah/Lebanon the previous year. It is a shameful rhetorical trick, and I am furious that a Labour Prime Minister is deploying it. I have to ask, what on earth did the Prime Minister think would happen after Iran was attacked? Did he think the Iranian regime would simply lay down its weapons? Did he think US and Israeli missiles would somehow blow some sense into them? Is he entirely unaware of the history of Western interference in Iran that led it from liberal democracy in 1953 to authoritarian theocracy by 1979? The idea that Iran would not react to being attacked is so patently absurd that I am forced to conclude that the Prime Minister had already made the decision to allow British bases to be used, but needed the plausible deniability of not allowing it in the initial wave of attacks.

The decision to allow use of UK bases to facilitate strikes against Iran was made with no parliamentary vote, no published legal opinion, and no meaningful public debate, instead relying on fundamentally undemocratic royal prerogative powers to bypass parliament. The fact this has become convention makes it no more justifiable. Is this how a Labour government thinks a democracy should conduct itself? If the government believes it has the legal and moral authority to permit attacks on Iran from British soil, it should have the courage to say so openly, to publish the advice it received in full, and to face a free vote. The fact that it has done none of these things suggests it knows it would lose.

Allowing US forces to use British bases in these circumstances increases the likelihood of deeper UK entanglement, exposes British personnel and assets to retaliation, and sends the message that regardless of what the Prime Minister may say, the United Kingdom is not a force for de-escalation or diplomacy, but a willing participant in brutal and illegal violence. That is not the role this country should be playing. It should be using its influence to press for an immediate ceasefire, adherence to international law, and for a negotiated settlement that prevents further loss of life. Instead, it is enabling more strikes, more deaths, and more suffering.

I am therefore asking you to provide clear and unequivocal answers to the following questions:

1. Do you personally support the Prime Minister's decision to permit the use of UK bases for these strikes, and if so, on what legal and moral basis?
2. Will you demand the immediate publication of the full legal advice provided to the government regarding the lawfulness of these strikes and the UK's role in facilitating them?
3. Will you call for an urgent parliamentary debate, and if necessary a binding vote, on any continued UK involvement in or facilitation of military action against Iran?
4. Do you condemn the reported killing of more than 150 people, including schoolchildren, in the Israeli strike on a school in Iran, and will you publicly call on the government to prioritise de-escalation, diplomacy, and adherence to international law over further military entanglement?

The United Kingdom should be upholding international law and working to reduce violence, not enabling further bloodshed from its own soil. I hope your integrity will compel a response that addresses these questions directly, without evasion or platitudes.

Yours sincerely,

[YOUR NAME]

[YOUR ADDRESS]