

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*)
www.directionofconflict.org

OPEN LETTER (by special delivery)

Your refs: C1/2018/1827 & 1828/PTA

The Rt Hon. Lord Justice Holroyde,
Civil Appeals Office,
Room E307,
Royal Courts of Justice,
Strand,
London WC2A 2LL

24 September 2022.

Dear Lord Holroyde,

Re: The Queen on the application of Peter Southwood v The Rt Hon. Lord Goldsmith QC (Respondent) & H.M. Attorney General (Interested Party) – 1 November 2018

You may recall the above case and my subsequent open letter to you dated 11 November 2018 (as enclosed), which you acknowledged through your clerk. Did I not forewarn you therein of the consequences of your decisions? Since 24 February 2022 they have materialised, in the form of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and we stand – as foreseen in the last three paragraphs of my letter – on the brink of a Great Power war and threat of annihilation because the principal conclusion of the Iraq Inquiry Report was lost to us.

I respectfully remind you of the main grounds, contained in my letter of 11 November 2018, for publicly questioning your reasons for refusing my appeal. [The High Court, at the behest of the Interested Party and Defendant, certified my claim as being ‘totally without merit’]:

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. Your decision made no reference to the judgments concerning the Project on Demilitarisation (Prodem) and the authoritative definition of ‘an irenical perspective’ provided by the High Court on 9 October 1998, emphatically endorsed by the Court of Appeal on 28 June 2000. Without this, the above case against the Defendant (Lord Goldsmith) could not have arisen. [The Claim Form section 3 ‘**Details of the decision to be judicially reviewed**’ stated ‘Failure to act as Law Officer, in his advice to the UK government on the legality of the invasion of Iraq, by omitting from his deliberations an “irenical perspective” as previously defined in law and revealed in The Report of the Iraq Inquiry.’ I submit it was impossible for you to overlook this material omission.]
2. Your decision made light of one count of apparent perjury committed by the Interested Party and supported by the Respondent. [My proposal that the Court issue an order on whether the matter raised should be referred to the police was described as ‘misconceived’ but you did not give ‘...any reason – let alone a good reason –...’* for considering it to be so.] In October 2019 I published a summary of my legal case that the Interested Party and Defendant had chosen to commit criminal offences under the Perjury Act 1911 rather than admit error in the above civil case in 2018 – a copy is attached for your convenience. Had they succeeded, which they did not, in persuading the courts to their view that the Interested Party was the ‘correct defendant’ – thereby implying that no error had been made in an official court document when, on 24 April 2018, the Interested Party signed on behalf of the Defendant – then they would have drawn the judges themselves into their own criminality, as I allege it to be.
3. Your decision was based on expediency, not on the rule of law, just as the Court of Appeal decision in the Prodem case on 28 June 2000 had been. I rely, and in each case said so at the time, on the verdict of the Court of history not on governmental or public opinion. The crushing verdicts of 9/11 and 24/2 delivered by the Supreme Judge and Lord of history have, on each occasion, rendered null and void the rule of expediency.

Conclusion

Your competency is not in doubt (unlike that of the two judges of the court below) so, as I said on 11 November 2018, you have no excuse or justification for point 1 above; still less for the unreasonableness of 2; or for undermining education on an irenical perspective (point 3), unlike the expediency of the Appeal Court’s decision in the Prodem case which did not.

If before All Saints Day – the fourth anniversary of your decisions – you have not drawn the obvious conclusion and, of your own volition, acted accordingly then I refer this case to Him alone, that He may judge between us as to whether His laws or your expediency shall prevail.

Yours sincerely,

Peter M. Southwood (Dr)

* The quote is from *R (on application of Miller) (Appellant) v The Prime Minister (Respondent)* [2019] UKSC 41 at paragraph 61. It refers to the lack of evidence that the Prime Minister provided 'any reason – let alone a good reason – to advise Her Majesty to prorogue Parliament for five weeks...' Although this case, concerning the process and not whether or on what terms the United Kingdom should leave the European Union, post-dates your decisions of 1 November 2018 the UK Supreme Court was underlining a constitutional principle of longstanding that government in this country cannot govern without reason. I take this to apply to the judiciary, as to the executive and legislative arms of government.

Note

Originally the intention had been to date this letter 11 September 2022, but it was delayed as a mark of respect for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II who died on 8 September. In her unstinting support for the armed forces of the United Kingdom and tireless search for peace between peoples and nations Her Majesty, in my view, symbolised an irenic perspective.

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.

cc Rt Hon. Michael Ellis KC MP
Attorney General

Sir Mark Rowley QPM
Metropolitan Police Commissioner

A private prosecution relating to the Perjury Act 1911 was not possible for financial reasons. The details were not passed to the police earlier due to the judge's unsubstantiated comment at point 2 on page 2 above.

The defendants in my attached summary case, or potential suspects in any police investigation, are:

Rt Hon. Sir Jeremy Wright KC MP ('D1') – Attorney General in 2018 until 9 July

Rt Hon. Sir Geoffrey Cox KC MP ('D2') – Attorney General in 2018 from 9 July

Rt Hon. the Lord Goldsmith KC ('D3') – Attorney General in 2003