



# Britain Not Officially at War but Fully Engaged on the Front-Line of Deadly War Zones

Par [Graham Vanbergen](#)

Mondialisation.ca, 11 août 2016

[TruePublica](#)

Région : [Europe](#)

Thème: [US NATO War Agenda](#)

*« We do not disclose details of all ongoing operations, (says the MoD), as disclosure would prejudice the security of the Armed Forces.» This is the stock answer given to any journalist attempting to enquire why it is that Britain is officially not at war with any country yet combat troops, special forces, fighter bombers and killer drones operate as though the opposite was true.*

In 2011, as parliament was asked to approve military deployment in Libya, William Hague, Secretary of State at the time, promised that the government would “[enshrine in law](#) for the future the necessity of consulting parliament on military action”.

This was supposedly to be an historic pledge – the first time the House of Commons’ role in the very serious decisions the government takes on war and peace was to be formalised. Clearly, there was no appetite for world peace. Frenzied lobbyists for weapons manufacturers got to work, soon after, members of parliament whose [pensions depend in part on war](#) dropped Hague’s proposal.

Five years later, thousands of British servicemen and women are now serving in some of the world’s most dangerous war zones against countries we are not at war with, and all without the consent of the British people. Much of the mainstream media will have you believe that parliament is being left in the dark when it comes to British troops in active service in dangerous war-zones such as [HERE](#), [HERE](#), [HERE](#) or [HERE](#) but as you will read, this article is made up entirely of media reports that members of parliament can read for themselves.

**Ukraine:** [Global Research](#) reported over a year ago that “US President Barack Obama revealed the United States’ involvement in the Ukrainian crisis from its outset and admitted that the United States “had brokered a deal to transition power in Ukraine.” For clarity the report went further: “Obama’s statement is reiterating something that the world public opinion already knew — the US was involved in the coup of [ex-Ukrainian President] Viktor Yanukovich from the start.

To help the transition from democratically elected president to a Neo-Nazi government populated by extreme fascists, British troops arrived...to help them. And as [Ukraine Today](#) reported just six months ago “Britain has recently announced its plans to sign a 15-year military co-operation pact with Ukraine. According to the agreement British troops will carry out ‘training missions’ with Ukrainian troops and the two countries will share intelligence data.”

It’s Good to know Britain’s government and top military brass are happy to facilitate fascism on the doorstep of Europe. This was confirmed again when Britain actively voted for Ukraine to adopt a roadmap for its ascension into the European Union. Fortunately, this plan was

scuppered (reported by RT) by [Germany and France along with Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands](#) who have made it clear this should never happen. Entry to the EU could have turned Ukraine into a NATO member that would turn relations with Russia from dire to deadly.

**Syria:** British journalist [Dan Glazebrook](#) reported for RT that “British special forces are now in direct combat roles in Syria. The Times also reported June 6th; “[UK special forces take frontline role in Syria](#)” and confirmation was made that this was not for ‘training’ purposes as widely reported by other mainstream media outlets. It was reported that British troops were equipped with anti-tank missiles, machine guns and sniper rifles – ready for full combat duties.

The deployment of ‘special forces’ does not require the sanction of parliament in Britain, therefore circumventing the need for parliamentary permission.

**Iraq:** On 30th June we learn via [The Telegraph](#) that the UK’s Defence Secretary, ordered a ‘training team’ of soldiers as well as a squadron of engineers and air base guards to join the British effort in the country. British army engineers are also there longer term in support. Britain is effectively opting for a long-term military presence in Iraq, even though political pressure to withdraw ‘fully and completely’ was confirmed by the last troops leaving May 2011 after a 7-year bloodbath based on lies and deception. No debate has taken place about Britain’s new role in the war-torn country that British journalist [Felicity Arbuthnot](#) described some time ago with pin-point accuracy as “sliding from the impossible, to the apocalyptic”.

**Afghanistan:** [The Guardian](#) reported on July 9th that “At a Nato summit in Poland, the prime minister’s deputy official spokesman said the UK would be increasing the size of its mission and delaying the departure of the last remaining forces in the country sometime into 2017.” Contrary to the government position that all troops had left Afghanistan in 2014 after thirteen years of fighting, we learn that in fact not all troops had actually left the country and that what remained is to be increased, without a new withdrawal deadline.

**Libya:** In April 2011, David Cameron [formally stated](#) that he had “ruled out an international invasion of Libya to remove Muammar Gaddafi.” Allies had to look at “what more can we do to protect civilian life and to stop Gaddafi’s war machine unleashing such hell on his own people”, he said. The international effort to bomb Libya into submission was subsequently led largely by Britain and France and ended with Cameron [grand-standing](#) in Tripoli’s Martyrs Square January 2013 declaring victory and committing wholehearted support of the Libyan people. What Britain unleashed was exactly described so well by Cameron’s own words – ‘hell on its people’. This, the richest nation per capita in Africa, with less poverty than Denmark, free health-care and education and the longest life span on the continent – all gone.

As Africa’s [Mail&Guardian](#) reported just a few months back Cameron’s victory has led to what is now seen as a growing ISIS stronghold as “Islamic State sees Libya as its most promising safe haven. As the spread of the terror group is stemmed and then rolled back in Iraq and Syria, it is relocating key combatants to Libya.” [The Times and Telegraph](#) both confirmed that the result of removing Gaddafi has led to a disastrous security vacuum in Libya.

In May this year, Britain sent troops just for protection purposes. The Defence Secretary

went public to formally state Britain has not engaged troops in Libya. Days later 'special forces' were in combat on the front-line. Since then we learn from the media that at least 1,000 British troops were [deployed](#) just to defend oil fields, let alone fight in the battlefields.

**North Africa:** It now appears that British army chiefs have authorised the deployment of bomb disposal personnel across North Africa. There is a growing prominence of Islamic State in Libya that is now spreading across the region much to the alarm of European politicians who are very worried by the strong possibility of a terrorist launch pad being fully established just across the Mediterranean from Europe's mainland.

**Yemen:** There have been many reports of Britain's SAS (again 'Special Forces') operating in Yemen. . [The Guardian](#) also reported a few months back that British personnel serving in Yemen said a Special Reconnaissance Regiment (another special forces unit), seconded to MI6, were training Yemeni forces who were fighting al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsular. The full extent of British forces deployment is, as yet, publicly at least, unclear.

**Europe:** The deployment of a 500-strong battalion to Estonia with a further company of 150 troops to be stationed in Poland "on an enduring basis" was [announced](#) by the government just last month in a bid to let Russia's President Putin that we mean business if they attacked any member nation of NATO. Troops will be backed up with RAF Typhoon fighter jets in eastern Europe.

**Drone Attacks:** [Drone Wars UK](#) reported recently that "Analysis of data released by the Ministry of Defence shows that British air strikes in Iraq and Syria in the first half of the year increased by 85% over the previous six months." Drone Wars UK is an archive of British bombing activity across the whole mid-east region including Pakistan, Somalia and the like. But it doesn't end there as Palestinian's found out during Israel's 'Operation Protective Edge' that slaughtered thousands two years ago. One method of delivering that carnage was by the use of [British made attack drones](#) armed with British munitions and serviced and maintained by British personnel.

What is striking about all this covert military activity is that Parliament has not formally been informed about any of these deployments, let alone been given the opportunity to debate them, or indeed to work out if any military action is in the best interests of Britain or the British people. It now appears that the only strategy operating is not pro-active but more reactive as the results of our ill-advised strategy (of slavishly adhering to Washington's demands) to destabilise the middle east unravels into the blood-soaked disaster that it is today.

What followed was inevitable; a refugee crisis that is actually [worse than that of WW2](#) . It is now known that 60 million innocent people have been driven from their homes, families and communities by the actions of politicians with an agenda and frankly, not a damned clue or care for the misery inflicted. The rise of terrorism on our doorsteps is just as inevitable for the decades ahead.

La source originale de cet article est [TruePublica](#)  
Copyright © [Graham Vanbergen](#), [TruePublica](#), 2016

---

Articles Par : **Graham**  
**Vanbergen**

**Avis de non-responsabilité** : Les opinions exprimées dans cet article n'engagent que le ou les auteurs. Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation se dégage de toute responsabilité concernant le contenu de cet article et ne sera pas tenu responsable pour des erreurs ou informations incorrectes ou inexacts.

Le Centre de recherche sur la mondialisation (CRM) accorde la permission de reproduire la version intégrale ou des extraits d'articles du site [Mondialisation.ca](http://Mondialisation.ca) sur des sites de médias alternatifs. La source de l'article, l'adresse url ainsi qu'un hyperlien vers l'article original du CRM doivent être indiqués. Une note de droit d'auteur (copyright) doit également être indiquée.

Pour publier des articles de [Mondialisation.ca](http://Mondialisation.ca) en format papier ou autre, y compris les sites Internet commerciaux, contactez: [media@globalresearch.ca](mailto:media@globalresearch.ca)

[Mondialisation.ca](http://Mondialisation.ca) contient du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur, dont le détenteur n'a pas toujours autorisé l'utilisation. Nous mettons ce matériel à la disposition de nos lecteurs en vertu du principe "d'utilisation équitable", dans le but d'améliorer la compréhension des enjeux politiques, économiques et sociaux. Tout le matériel mis en ligne sur ce site est à but non lucratif. Il est mis à la disposition de tous ceux qui s'y intéressent dans le but de faire de la recherche ainsi qu'à des fins éducatives. Si vous désirez utiliser du matériel protégé par le droit d'auteur pour des raisons autres que "l'utilisation équitable", vous devez demander la permission au détenteur du droit d'auteur.

Contact média: [media@globalresearch.ca](mailto:media@globalresearch.ca)