

UK sending air defence systems to Gulf: PM

● **The UK now has more military jets in the region “than at any time in the last 15 years”**

● **Deploying Rapid Sentry anti-drone system to Kuwait**

AFP | London, United Kingdom

Britain is sending short-range air defence systems to the Gulf to help counter Iranian missile attacks, Prime Minister Keir Starmer said Monday.

“We’re deploying short range air defence systems to Bahrain at speed,” Starmer told a parliamentary committee, adding the UK was “doing the same with Kuwait and Saudi Arabia”.

The UK is working with industry to “distribute air defence missiles to Gulf partners”, which have faced waves

of Iranian barrages in retaliation for US-Israeli strikes, and has embedded airspace specialists there, Starmer said.

Defence minister John Healey told parliament the country would be deploying its Rapid Sentry anti-drone system to Kuwait.

He called this a “battle-tested ground-based air defence missile system that has already proved highly effective for UK forces taking down drones in the region”.

A British warship, HMS Dragon, has also arrived in the eastern Mediterranean to defend Cyprus, Healey said.

Britain deployed the vessel following criticism over a perceived slow response to a drone attack on Britain’s Akrotiri base in southern Cyprus after the United States and Israel launched their war against Iran on February 28.

The UK now has more military jets in the region “than at any time in the last 15 years” and has boosted air defence personnel

in Cyprus by 500, Healey said.

He added that UK pilots had now spent nearly 900 hours flying in the region “in defence of Cyprus, Jordan, Bahrain, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates” as Iran has unleashed volleys of drones at countries in the region.

‘Keeping UK safe’

Britain is determined to play a “leading role in securing the strait so commercial ships can move freely and confidently again”, its defence minister said, referring to the strategic choke-point through which much of the world’s crude oil and natural gas passes.

Iran on Friday launched two missiles towards the Diego Garcia base, Healey said, but neither reached their target and “normal operations continue”.

“I totally condemn Iran’s reckless attacks. Iran must stop, it must de-escalate. We want to see this war end now,” the minister said.

But he offered assurances,

saying: “There is no assessment that we are being targeted in the UK”.

“We have the resources, we have the alliances in place in order to keep the United Kingdom safe from any kind of attacks.”



The UK government is allowing Washington to use its bases in Diego Garcia in the Chagos Islands and Fairford in southwest England to fly US bombing missions targeting Iranian “missile sites and capabilities being used to attack ships in the Strait of Hormuz”.

WIDE ANGLE

The Whys and Wherefores of Wars



JOEL INDRUPATI

War leaves no victors. This weighty truth is often ignored by nations.

Time and again, leaders abandon diplomacy and negotiation, choosing brute military force because they believe it safeguards their interests—whether national or personal.

In an essay titled “The Peace of the World,” published in The New York Times on February 21, 1915, H. G. Wells made a powerful appeal:

“Probably there have never been so many people convinced of the dreadfulness of war, nor so large a proportion anxious to end war... so that this huge hideousness of hardship, suffering, destruction, and killing that continues in Europe may never again be repeated.”

Wells wrote this when World War I had just begun. But sadly, that war had gone on for four more years, until 1919. Even though he hoped, in a positive way, that it “would end all war,” World War II (1939-1945) had followed.

These two wars brought immense destruction to life and property, costing millions of lives and trillions of dollars. The widespread misery they caused is still not fully quantifiable, and many nations have yet to fully recover.

Yet humanity seems determined not to learn. We cling to the belief that military might is the ultimate guarantee of strength and security. But is it?

Some say that wars never actually end—they merely subside and then reignite, mainly because hostilities are never effectively addressed. Hatred toward one another grows out of fear and distrust, pride and prejudice. And several leaders use constant vilification of others to win the support of their own people. Political narratives are framed as ‘our good’ against ‘their evil’. It’s “us” against “them.”

Let us ask ourselves: why are wars generally fought? Most arise from disputes over territory, resources, and security—the control of oil, water, or borders, and the pursuit of power. Ideological differences and ethnic tensions further inflame these conflicts.

But must these differences lead us to war? That is the challenge before us—to engage in dialogue and resolve our disagreements constructively, without resorting to needless destruction.

Let us also consider the philosophy of war, where three perspectives dominate: Realism, Pacifism, and Just War Theory.

Realists like Thomas Hobbes argued that war is inevitable, rooted in human nature. Pacifists such as Leo Tolstoy and Bertrand Russell rejected war as irrational and destructive, insisting that it can be avoided.

Between these two schools of thought stand the Just War theorists, like Augustine of Hippo and Thomas Aquinas, who believe that war may be justified only under strict moral conditions—if it meets criteria such as just cause, legitimate authority, right intention, and proportional conduct.

Yet the question persists: can any war truly be just?

No. Perhaps not. Because “only the dead have seen the end of war,” said the philosopher, George Santayana.

Perhaps the real answer lies not in theory, but in action. Each of us possesses a conscience—a moral compass that we can use to guide our actions.

This right of conscience is a fundamental human right, protecting an individual’s freedom to act upon deeply held moral, ethical, or religious beliefs.

It is safeguarded under international law, including Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and Article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), and it guarantees the freedom to think, believe, and act according to one’s conscience without state coercion.

We can and we must engage with our leaders, insist on dialogue over destruction, wisdom over impulse, and humanity over hatred. If war begins in the minds of people, then peace must be forged there too—and it must begin with us, now, before history repeats its cost once again.

(The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the Daily Tribune)

‘Point of no return’ looming in Middle East war: Red Cross

● **In response to Trump’s initial threat, Iran had threatened to deploy naval mines in the Gulf and target power plants across the region**

● **Energy infrastructure has been repeatedly hit since the start of the war on February 28**

AFP | Geneva, Switzerland

The International Committee of the Red Cross demanded Monday a halt to the “war on essential infrastructure” in the Middle East, warning of potential “irreversible consequences” including harm to nuclear facilities.

“What we have seen in recent days in the Middle East risks reaching a point of no return,” ICRC president Mirjana Spoljaric warned in a statement.

“Most alarming is the potential harm to nuclear facilities, whether deliberate or incidental,” she said.

Energy infrastructure has been repeatedly hit since the start of the war on February 28, when the United States and Israel began their attacks on Iran. Tehran has responded by striking targets in Israel and Gulf states.

Over the weekend, an Iranian strike hit the southern Israeli town of Dimona, home to a nuclear facility, in what Tehran said was in response to an ear-

Iran foreign ministry says got messages from ‘friendly countries’ about US request for talks

Tehran, Iran

Iran’s foreign ministry said Monday that it had received messages through “friendly countries” about a request from the United States for talks, but denied any such negotiations had taken place since the start of the war.

“Over the past few days,

messages were received through some friendly countries indicating a US request for negotiations aimed at ending the war,” said foreign ministry spokesman Esmail Baqaei, according to the official IRNA news agency.

However, he “denied any negotiations or talks with the United States during the past 24 days of the imposed war”.

lier attack on its nuclear site at Natanz.

“Damage to these sites could trigger irreversible consequences, which is why they are afforded heightened protections under the rules of war,” Spoljaric said.

She cautioned that “war on essential infrastructure is war on civilians”.

“Deliberate attacks on essential services and civilian infrastructure can amount to war crimes.”

Her comments came as US President Donald Trump suddenly backtracked on a threat to “obliterate” Iran’s power infrastructure if it did not reopen the strategic Strait of Hormuz.

In response to Trump’s initial threat, Iran had threatened to deploy naval mines in the Gulf and target power plants across the region.

On Monday, Trump said he was putting his ultimatum on hold after “very good” talks with unidentified Iranian officials, while Iranian media outlets quoted the foreign ministry in Tehran denying any negotiations and suggesting Trump was angling to bring down energy prices.

“Attacks on essential infrastructure have already punished millions of civilians both near and far from the front lines,” Spoljaric said in her statement.

“This pattern, combined with an escalatory rhetoric that disregards the limits imposed by international humanitarian law, normalises a style of warfare that strips away our shared humanity.”



Power plants in Iran

Electricity plants by fuel type

- Nuclear
- Gas
- Oil
- Hydro
- Solar



Source: World Resources Institute, data as of Oct. 6, 2025

Map data: OSM, NASA

AFP

Some say that wars never actually end—they merely subside and then reignite, mainly because hostilities are never effectively addressed. Hatred toward one another grows out of fear and distrust, pride and prejudice