

The Education of Nations... in Securing Peace and Avoiding War

January 2020 onwards

Peter M. Southwood (Dr)
Law Officer for Public Benefit in England and Wales
(*de jure* by the Court of history since 24 February 2022)
www.directionofconflict.org

Open Letter

Rt Hon Victoria Prentis KC MP
H M Attorney General
Attorney General's Office
102 Petty France
London SW1H 9EA

28 June 2023.

Dear Madam,

Re: Sleepwalking into the Third Nuclear Detonation in War: Why?

One year on from my nuclear 'Red Alert' to Parliament I note that on 24 January 2023 the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists also moved the hands of its Doomsday Clock forward so that it now stands at 90 seconds to midnight – the closest it has ever been. This is, according to its Science and Security Board, largely due to the mounting dangers of the war in Ukraine.

Conversely, the political establishments in the United Kingdom and United States have generally rated the nuclear risks as low, both by their actions and leaders' public statements.

Who is to be trusted to tell the truth? My case rests on Re: Project on Demilitarisation (Prodem), an unreported case I undertook in person against H M Attorney General in 1998 and 2000, and the theological principles which motivated and sustained it then and ever since.

1. Responsibility

1.1 *What is at stake?*

- (a) Initially the people of Ukraine but, potentially, part or all of humanity.
- (b) Get this wrong and the horrors of the Great War and the Second World War, including the Holocaust, would pale before a scale of man-made annihilation never seen before.

cont'd/...

My Purpose:

To forewarn the public one more time that the world is heading for another Great Power war.

As in 1920, the reason is the failure of political institutions to apply 'an irenic perspective' even-handedly. Post-Cold War, the term was first defined in English charity law on 9 October 1998, drawing on a United States case of 1917, and affirmed by the Court of Appeal on 28 June 2000.

110 Purves Road, London NW10 5TB, England.
Mobile no: 07821 390492 (voicemail) Email: consultant@directionofconflict.org

1.2 *What method to rely upon?*

- (a) Political wisdom: which took humanity in thirty short years from the miracle (or sign) of the mostly peaceful ending of the Cold War to a new and violent division of Europe?
- (b) Education: which rightly foresaw, in the 4 out of 6 Prodem Briefings I alone edited (1993-1995), the disaster we now face, tested and underpinned by the Prodem legal case?
- (c) The laws of God or Parliaments: which of these proved decisive in the period 1990 – 2022: the Court of history or of public opinion? The Golden Rule or the rule of politics?

1.3 *Who is to be held accountable and how?*

- (a) First and foremost in England and Wales since 28 June 2000, you and your predecessors still living because Attorneys General ignored the warnings of a Great Power war escalating to the nuclear level and *rejected without reason* the premise of peace ('an irenical perspective') which both the English courts and the Court of history have upheld.
- (b) Secondly, you yourself as 'Law Officer' based on evidence from Hansard since your appointment last year. Your focus, with respect to the Russia-Ukraine war, is on your 'absolute' commitment to the rule of law (1 Feb 2023), which I know is untrue, and on alleged Russian war crimes rather than on the risks of nuclear deterrence breaking down so that Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) becomes Mutual Assured Genocide (MAG).
- (c) Thirdly, as to how accountability is to be exercised, three of your predecessors stand publicly accused by me of offences under the Perjury Act 1911. Moreover, the shock of a third nuclear detonation (after Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945), when it comes on our current trajectory, combined with public knowledge of the biggest 'cover-up' of the basis for their peace and security in common law history, may produce very rapid changes in mass psychology. Are you and your predecessors, still living, ready for that?

2. The Third Nuclear Detonation in War

The three core assumptions and associated facts behind this analysis are:

2.1 *The enduring impact of the Manhattan Project and the use of two nuclear weapons against Japan in August 1945.*

- (a) The Manhattan Project was needed because there was no reasonable doubt that, if Hitler's Germany had managed to develop a nuclear weapon first, he would have been willing and able to use it despite, or because of, losing the Second World War.
- (b) The United States, a liberal democracy, did use atomic bombs against Hiroshima (6 August 1945) and a few days later Nagasaki:
 - (i) Only a veiled warning was given before the first.
 - (ii) These cities were primarily civilian targets.
 - (iii) This was done to spare the lives of American service personnel which a land invasion of Japan would have required.
- (c) There is no reason at all, from (a) to (b), to infer that Russia's possession of nuclear weapons on a par with the United States nor their veiled threats to use them against the West are 'rhetoric', particularly in the event of a conventional defeat in Ukraine that could be plausibly linked to Western military support, or Russia's resulting internal collapse into civil conflict or war. (The recent failed Wagner mutiny illustrates the risks.)

2.2 The mostly peaceful ending of the Cold War in 1990 is unrepeatable.

- (a) The enduring impact of Western handling of this seminal event; and
- (b) Their unwillingness, and that of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), to admit any primary fault or accept responsibility for their failure to secure peace in Europe;
- (c) When combined with Russian historical memory of (a) and (b), this virtually guarantees that the Russia-Ukraine war cannot end in a one-sided Russian admission of responsibility.

2.3 The climate for the Russian invasion of Ukraine on 24 February 2022 (and other armed conflicts around the world) was created at the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s.

- (a) It was foreseen on an irenic perspective, in the 4 out of 6 Prodem Briefings I edited and mostly wrote myself in the early 1990s, resulting from the one-sidedness of the peace settlement across each dimension of security: military, economic and institutional.
- (b) The Russian President has responsibility for initiating the invasion of Ukraine in 2022 but none at all for creating the climate for war in the 1990s before he came to power.
- (c) It must follow from (a) and (b) that if a State or alliance of States (e.g. NATO) creates the climate (or conditions) for war then a state of war will be the expected result over the long term. *Politics cannot override logic arising from the material facts of a given conflict.*

2.4 Consequences

Factors 2.1 to 2.3 all impel the competing entities involved in the Russia-Ukraine war towards escalation threatening to reach the nuclear level. Accepting the possibility of the use of other weapons of mass destruction (WMD), e.g. chemical or biological, and in other spheres of conflict, e.g. a collapsing North Korea, or by non-State entities, e.g. terrorist groups, which could occur first, the nuclear risks appear greater than during the Cuban missile crisis in 1962:

- (a) After implicitly recognising his role in precipitating the nuclear crisis with the United States, by placing nuclear weapons on the island of Cuba, the Soviet leader Khrushchev then negotiated with US President Kennedy to find a peaceful way out of the crisis.
- (b) Ukraine, in seeking early membership of NATO and, thereby the protection of Article 5 and the US nuclear shield would, if successful while the Russia-Ukraine war persists or even in the context of a lull in hostilities, result in a Cuban missile crisis in reverse, i.e. a position from which it would be almost impossible for Russia to back down (as for the US).
- (c) In the absence of such a US-backed nuclear guarantee, the main constraints on Russian use of its WMD, especially nuclear, are:
 - (i) That its objectives, however revised and reduced from the original, are achievable by conventional means due to: greater military and economic resources than Ukraine (notwithstanding Western aid and sanctions on Russia); and the greater willingness to take casualties (stretching back into Soviet times) and to endure, if necessary, over the long term.
 - (ii) The official neutrality of China and India, the two most populous countries in the world, with respect to the Russia-Ukraine war and the economic support they are providing to Russia.

- In the case of China, that its issues with the West over Taiwan, which was part of China since the Qing dynasty conquered it in the seventeenth century, except for periods of Japanese occupation in the late Qing and Republican eras, are the opposite of Russia's issue with the West over Ukraine, which was not part of Russia (except for Crimea in the Soviet era until Khrushchev). However, as this distinction is not generally made in the West and is implicit only where the Communist government of the People's Republic is recognised but not that of the Republic of China (Taiwan), this constraint in China's support for Russia may be removed at any time especially if war breaks out over Taiwan.
- (iii) International law and a near-universal presumption against the use of nuclear weapons but
- An anarchic system of sovereign states in the world today nowhere recognises the primacy of international law except in so far as each State has chosen to do so (e.g. the role of the European Court of Justice in the European Union). Thus statements that 'according to international law' are generally reflecting individual or collective national viewpoints on these matters which are normally unenforceable except by individual, or alliances of, States and now rarely through the United Nations (UN) in view of Great Power rivalry.
 - *Public opinion, especially in the UK and USA, has become much more quiescent about nuclear weapons in a way that would have been inconceivable during the Cold War* when memories of the actual use of nuclear weapons against Japan were fresh in people's minds, whether they supported or opposed nuclear disarmament. *This quiescence constitutes the 'sleepwalking' aspect of my case – knowledge of what a third nuclear detonation would do is mostly intellectual not felt.*
 - Now that Russia has declared occupied parts of Ukraine to be Russian territory, though not internationally recognised, their rationale for potential use of nuclear weapons in its self-defence has been established as a last resort.

3. Dishonesty and Fraud

3.1 You and your predecessors, and their governments and Parliaments with all the vast resources of the State (and its allies) at their disposal, proved completely unable to stop the inexorable march to war, particularly with Russia (so far, via Ukraine), which my four Prodem Briefings (1993-1995) had foreseen on an irenic perspective.

3.2 When Russia invaded Ukraine on 24 February 2022 none of you would admit that, in the last Prodem Briefing A/3 (October 1995), I had concluded it was impossible that the post-Cold War peace settlement could have secured peace in Europe (or globally).

3.3 Now confronted by the prospect of the third nuclear detonation in war, you and your predecessors have chosen not to admit dishonesty arising from the Prodem legal case [9 October 1998 and 28 June 2000] as this would expose the conflicted roles of English Attorneys General and destroy your and your predecessors' status as Law Officers.

3.4 Consequences

- (a) From 3.1 political power – including liberal democratic and religious politics – cannot override the Court of history which works exclusively on an irenical perspective. Based on faith in Jesus Christ (attested in my first affidavit in the Prodem case), I knew Almighty God, as the supreme Judge, would control the destinies of nations according to His laws.
- (b) Hence, from 3.2, it is education on an irenical perspective – as defined in paragraph 26 of the High Court judgment – that is the wholly and exclusively charitable basis for securing a state of peace and avoiding a state of war *by the public benefit of competing analyses*:
- (i) This does not change the longstanding principle that the laws, policies and administrative decisions of government, domestic and foreign, are political objects and in the province of the Executive and Legislative arms of government.
 - (ii) However, the process of evaluating relations between entities as to whether they are moving in the direction of a state of peace or war, when judged by each party's emphasis on peaceful, rather than military, techniques of conflict resolution, is primarily an educational and scientific one, involving competing means of analysis.
 - (iii) In view of you and your predecessors' refusal to admit error, it follows that *the UK governments and Parliaments served were either careless or reckless as to whether a climate for war was being created at the end of the Cold War and thereafter or actively sought to create that climate for war which they could then hold your enemies responsible for starting*. The proof for this contention is that the Prodem court records and subsequent history show that:
 - The application of an irenical perspective was opposed in court *without reason*;
 - After the case, the principle continued to be opposed *without reason*;
 - This was, as you and your predecessors know, unconstitutional and illegal because a UK government cannot govern *without reason* (affirmed in the case brought by Mrs Miller before the Supreme Court in 2019, at paragraph 61).
- (c) Finally, from 3.3, the lengths to which you and your predecessors, together with the Charity Commission for England and Wales (pre- and post-Charities Act 2006) and the Government Legal Department (formerly Treasury Solicitor's Department), were prepared to go, assisted by certain members of the judiciary, to prevent the full application of the Prodem legal judgments, and thereby undermine the principal means to forewarn of the third nuclear detonation in war, is revealed by these facts:
- (i) *Allegedly dishonest behaviour within the English and Welsh judiciary.*
28 June 2000 – decision of Appeal judges (LJs Kennedy, Chadwick and May) in the Prodem legal case that this body was promoting demilitarisation (denied by me) *based on a lie*. The evidence of judicial falsification of a material fact was sent to the lead judge, who did not challenge it, and to the Legal Secretariat of the Law Officers. However, this judgment did uphold education based on an irenical perspective as legally charitable and provided the precise objects clause of a charity whose public benefit involved the main activity of Prodem, i.e. analysing the direction of international conflicts towards a state of peace rather than war.

28 August 2009 – decision of Administrative Court deputy judge (Lord Carlile of Berriew QC), *with active links to a political party and other conflicting interests* revealed in the court transcripts. He denied permission to the Trustees of the International Peace Project²⁰⁰⁰ (IPP), successor body to Prodem, to apply for judicial review against the Charity Commission’s alleged misconduct in preventing removal of The Atlantic Council of the United Kingdom from the register of charities in line with the *ratio* of the judges in the Prodem Appeal case.

16 June 2010 – decision of the Office for Judicial Complaints, presided over by the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales (Lord Judge) and the Lord Chancellor, that *Lord Carlile of Berriew’s misconduct (as IPP Trustees and I viewed it), was part of normal case management* and did not constitute a breach of judicial regulations.

1 November 2018 – Decision of Appeal Court (Civil Division) judge (LJ Holroyde) refusing my appeal from the Administrative Court in a judicial review case I brought against Lord Goldsmith claiming he failed to act as Law Officer in his advice to the UK government on the legality of the invasion of Iraq (in March 2003) by omitting from his deliberations an ‘irenical perspective’ as previously defined in law and revealed in The Report of the Iraq Inquiry (July 2016). The refusal was made without any reference to the Prodem case without which a request for judicial review could not have been made. The judge also made light of:

- (ii) *False testimony allegedly made by two Law Officers aided and abetted by a third.*
A summary of my case that defendants D1 (Jeremy Wright), D2 (Geoffrey Cox) and D3 (Lord Goldsmith) may have committed offences under the Perjury Act 1911 during the judicial review proceedings, which ended on **1 November 2018**, will be found on my website (Closing Bulletins, 31 October 2019).
- (iii) *Dishonest and (in certain cases) allegedly fraudulent behaviour within the English and Welsh political and social sciences*

2000-2023 – No education of this sector took place, after the Prodem case, on its implications. In particular, the standards applied during those legal proceedings were not applied either to registered charities or relevant University departments. As far as is known the IPP²⁰⁰⁰ is the only such body operating in full conformity with the Prodem legal principles in applying the findings of objective and scientific research to determine the direction of an international conflict to peace or war. The two examples of non-conformity below are particularly egregious:

2008-2009 – The Appeal judges in the Prodem case made clear in 2000 that ‘Nor, conversely, could the court recognise as charitable a trust to educate the public to an acceptance that war is best avoided by collective security through the membership of a military alliance – say, NATO.’ The Trustees of the Atlantic Council of the United Kingdom honestly acknowledged that they were promoting NATO but the Charity Commission’s attempts to obstruct and prevent the removal of this body from the register of charities (or its reform) have been fully documented.

2020-2022 – By letter dated 23 July 2021 I brought a criminal complaint against the Trustees and the Director-General and Chief Executive of The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) with respect to their Strategic Dossier Russia’s Military Modernisation (September 2020). They ‘cashed in’ after the Russian invasion of Ukraine in February 2022 in promoting a climate for war by sales of this document that deliberately omitted the whole history of Gorbachev’s ‘peace offensive’ in the late 1980s and early 1990s when he was Soviet leader.

Conclusion

How can you and your predecessors be trusted to tell the truth? There are only two kinds of truth in this world:

- *Factual truth*; and the decision of the Prodem legal case of 28 June 2000 rests on a lie.
- *The Word of God*; which is the basis of His Kingdom or Reign on earth as in heaven, revealed in holy scripture through the Jewish prophets, supremely Jesus Christ, and (in the line of Ishmael) by the Prophet of Islam. This Kingdom, standing over and above all earthly kingdoms, derives from our Creator and Redeemer. The trial judge defined an irenical perspective in the Prodem case [9 October 1998 at paragraph 26], which the Court of Appeal endorsed and provided the precise wording of what became the objects of the International Peace Project²⁰⁰⁰ (charity reg. no. 1101966) to continue the principal aims and activities of Prodem. That definition is the outward and secular expression of the inward and spiritual grace that is the perspective of God's Kingdom. His judgments of 11 September 2001 and 24 February 2022 expressed His irrevocable and unchallengeable will against those authorities who had rebelled by abusing the gracious outcome He had granted for the ending of the Cold War. My four out of six Prodem Briefings stand as a permanent indictment of that rebellion against His sovereignty and laws expressed in the Golden Rule.

Now, therefore, you and your predecessors remaining obdurate and the governments and Parliaments you serve idolatrous (as warned in my letter to Parliament of 31 October 2014), in placing the primacy of politics above that of God's Kingdom and His blessing on all nations and peoples of 'an irenical perspective', to fulfil His purposes in Jesus Christ of peace and reconciliation, it is apparent that:

- Your people in these islands, your allies and enemies along with non-aligned nations are *all under suspended sentence of death in the face of the anticipated third nuclear detonation in war*, and threatened escalation therefrom, by reason of that folly and rebellion. The sentence can only be lifted by:
 - (a) *Containing politics within its divinely ordained limits of faith and reason*, based on an irenical perspective;
 - (b) *Reforming English and Welsh education on the strict basis of objectivity and political impartiality*, within the political and social sciences, in the differing means of securing a state of peace and avoiding a state of war;
 - (c) *Understanding that when the conditions for war are created between State and non-State entities then war must be expected sooner or later* but creating a climate for peace is the prerequisite for achieving that end – being a perpetual grace and obligation falling upon all persons of goodwill.

Highlighting the differences between grasping in 'a visceral way the meaning of nuclear war' by decision-makers and the general public alike in the 1950s and 60s, in the wake of the first two nuclear detonations in war in August 1945, with the 'glib reflections' of a journalist and many others before the onset of the Great War, one historian concluded:

In this sense, the protagonists of 1914 were sleepwalkers, watchful but unseeing, haunted by dreams, yet blind to the reality of the horror they were about to bring into the world.¹

This is the reality we now face because political institutions learn little that is fundamental from history. Afghanistan is another example: from Britain (1839-1919) to the Soviet Union (1979-1989) and on to the United States and the UK, again, (2001-2021). Afghan tribesmen have eventually defeated the Great Powers, repeatedly, because politics corrupts and leads the powerful into a world of self-delusion divorced from God and His laws – just as it did when the Taliban over-reached itself and allowed al-Qaeda to attack America on 9/11.

Now that inexorable cycle, faces the ultimate test of the third nuclear detonation in war which, on our current trajectory, would be a shattering of all current assumptions of restraint.

You and your predecessors bear the main responsibility, within your unholy trinity in England and Wales, for the lack of any widespread educational and religious restraint, based on the public benefit of an irenical perspective, in analysing the Russia-Ukraine war and such like.

If restraint proves impossible, and a Great Power war erupts to the strategic nuclear level, you (and any successor) and your predecessors will face, as we all must, the supreme Judge of the Court of history, the Holy Trinity, who:

- Cannot be suborned;
- Is the Truth and, therefore, sees through all dishonesty and fraud;
- Alone has the power to save in this world and the next.

May God have mercy upon our immortal souls.

Yours faithfully,

Peter M. Southwood

Note

The author is fully and solely responsible for this letter and the contents of his website.

Distribution & Privacy Notice

This letter can be copied to those who are or may be interested provided it is done in full, without amendment or financial charge. The letter may also be quoted with due acknowledgement. It is distributed to named individuals because I have a legitimate interest in the matters raised therein.

Acknowledgements

Most material facts in this letter are too widely attested to require referencing here. However, the relevant legal cases are fully referenced on my website. See, especially, Article nos 1 and 2 of 18 January and 6 March 2019 respectively at: <https://www.directionofconflict.org/what-we-do>

¹. Christopher Clark, The Sleepwalkers: How Europe Went to War in 1914 (Penguin Books, 2013), p. 562. Naturally, this author has no responsibility for my application of his thesis to today's nuclear reality crisis.