

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



All Honourable Members
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA
United Kingdom

All Lords Spiritual and Temporal
House of Lords
London SW1A 0PW
United Kingdom

28 June 2022.

Dear Members and Peers,

Re: Court of History v UK Parliament and Its Allies – verdict of 24 February 2022

I have three questions for each of you to consider:

- Q.1 Which version of Russian demilitarisation did you prefer: Gorbachev (1985-1991) or Putin (24 February 2022 to date)?
- Q.2 If the West 'won' the Cold War, how did the first lead to the second?
- Q.3 If the risks are 'low' of the second leading to a Great Power war with Russia, escalating to the nuclear level, why move a crisis alert from *Amber* (2014) to *Red* (today)?

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

Q.1 Which Version of Russian Demilitarisation Did You Prefer?

In the early 1990s I preferred the first but foresaw the second. Why?

The former (Gorbachev, then Yeltsin) put the emphasis on peaceful means of resolving international disputes but because it was insufficiently reciprocated by the West it would be undermined and create the conditions for the latter – violent demilitarisation. I initiated a legal case, *re Project on Demilitarisation* (Prodem), to establish that education on ‘an irenical perspective’ was genuine and won the principle in the High Court (9 October 1998) and Court of Appeal (28 June 2000) but ‘lost’ the case. I observed at the Appeal hearing (on 10 March 2000) that the ‘court of history’ would provide its judgment, too. So it did: 124 days ago.

Q.2 If You Think the West ‘Won’ the Cold War, How Did the First Lead to the Second?

The basis of that warning was the four out of six Prodem Briefings, which I alone had edited and mostly written myself, published between 1993-1995, on Western handling of the end of the Cold War and its future consequences. Whereas the United States and United Kingdom claimed victory, I counter-claimed and sought to justify in Briefing No. 1 that, unlike Allied victories in the two world wars:

This time, though, the facts will reveal the hollowness of the claim. As we will show, the West did not win the Cold War but, as before, the Allies have been losing the peace and sowing the seeds for more potentially disastrous future conflicts. [p. 1]

By 24 February 2022, the matter was beyond argument:

- (i) The demise of Soviet communism was replaced, after Yeltsin’s nascent liberal democracy of the 1990s, by an increasingly virulent Russian nationalism allied to Chinese communism (previously allied to the United States).
- (ii) Historic arms control and disarmament treaties of the late 1980s and early 1990s have been lost, except one on strategic nuclear weapons. In its place has come increased military expenditure, rearmament, and force modernisation.
- (iii) The claim that US/UK ‘bargaining from strength’ and high military expenditures from the early 1980s delivered a knock-out blow to the USSR is contradicted today by:
 - Conventional force superiority of NATO vs Russia (cf. to Cold War military balance);
 - Annual military expenditure of the USA, let alone all NATO allies, being far beyond Russia and China combined (cf. higher Soviet military burden to keep up with USA);
 - None of the above, and threat of unprecedented economic sanctions, deterred the Russian invasion of Ukraine on 24 February 2022 or Russia’s implicit threat to use nuclear weapons, if the Western alliance intervenes militarily.

So violent demilitarisation replaced the peaceful variety, both emanating from Russia, for:

- While Russia undoubtedly started the war in Ukraine on 24 February 2022...
- The conditions arose from the US/UK anti-appeasement of the 1980s and 1990s, which would sow the seeds of war, just as Briefing No. 1 agreed appeasement did in the 1930s.
- It underlines the need for education on an irenical perspective to counter political propaganda which continues to mislead an unsuspecting public by *factual omission*.

Q.3 If You Think the Risks of a Nuclear War are Low, Why Move from Amber to Red Alert?

In 2014 I issued an Amber nuclear warning – meaning an ‘Initial alert to a crisis potentially involving the threat or use of nuclear weapons’ – following the Russian occupation of Crimea, in response to the overthrow of a Russia-friendly government in Ukraine, and Russian support for rebels in the Donbas region of eastern Ukraine.

In 2022 UK and US governments have repeatedly assured their publics – as reported and reinforced by the BBC News – that the risks are ‘low’ of the war between Russia and Ukraine leading to a NATO war with Russia, escalating to the nuclear level. At the same time, they and their allies are encouraging and assisting, militarily and economically, the government of Ukraine to ‘win’ the war with Russia which involves escalation and perpetuation of the war:

- Each escalation in the Russia-Ukraine war, between two States of widely differing military and economic capabilities, must increase the likelihood of direct military involvement of NATO – as the Ukrainian government strongly urged at the start of the war in terms of establishing a no-fly zone. This may be accidentally or through misunderstanding and miscalculation. It could, though, be deliberate by either side desperate to ‘win’ at all costs.
- Any military conflict between NATO and Russia (with its much smaller military alliance) would, as previously pointed out, be highly one-sided at the conventional level both in terms of military personnel and major weapon systems, quantitatively and (in most respects) qualitatively. Only in strategic nuclear weapons does Russia have a rough parity with the United States, the two nuclear superpowers (as they have been from the 1950s).
- Consequently, Russia cannot risk a conventional war with NATO when its strategic nuclear strength might be diminished or eliminated by land, sea, and air attacks. Moreover, a NATO nuclear first strike might reduce their capability to respond. Russia must also take account of US anti-missile defences, in particular. Escalation to the strategic nuclear level would be very likely to take place early and, after what has happened to Ukrainian cities like Mariupol, there is no reason to doubt a Russian willingness to use their ‘deterrent’.

Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) would become Mutual Assured Genocide (MAG).

That is why I have today issued a Red Alert which I defined in 2014 as a ‘Crisis involving a high risk of the threatened or actual use of nuclear weapons.’

Conclusion

The Amber nuclear warning of 2014 referred to Prodem Briefing A/1 (1993) that posited ‘NATO vs Russia’ and ‘Ukraine vs Russia’ as major war scenarios. The disaster and tragedy taking place in Ukraine today was foreseen and entirely avoidable for whereas:

- Russia undoubtedly started the war on 24 February this year;
- The West created the conditions for this war (and others) to come about through its reliance on the ‘balance of power’ and failure to take account of the ‘balance of peace’ i.e. peaceful methods of conflict resolution’, my unique contribution.

Parliament’s political method of forecasting failed; my educational method did not.

The primary duty of government and Parliament is to the survival of your people in peace and security. In seeking a Ukrainian (or Russian) victory both sides must explain to their publics how such escalation and prolongation reduces, rather than, increases the risk of MAD →MAG. I put it to each one of you that the deception perpetrated by Western 'victory' in the Cold War is now being replaced by the claim that the current risks of a Great Power war are low. Even liberal democracies engage in such propaganda, reinforced by the BBC News service.

Only education on an irenic perspective can provide a counterbalance at home and abroad. Such a body exists, and I trust, as *de jure* Law Officer for Public Benefit, that the law set out authoritatively in the Prodem case will now be upheld and enforced in England and Wales because it is the business of genuine education to seek to ascertain and apply the truth; as it is the business of Parliament and Executive to govern on irenic, as well as military, advice.

Today's Red alert means for each one of us: face the Truth to forestall annihilation.

Yours faithfully,

Peter M. Southwood (Dr)

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.

Further Information

Peter Southwood, General Editor and Editor Series A, Project on Demilitarisation (Prodem) Briefings:

The Triumph of Unilateralism: The Failure of Western Militarism, Briefing No. 1 (Prodem, March 1993), 69pp ISBN 1-898079-00-5; NATO's Military Supremacy: What is It For? Briefing A/1 (Prodem, September 1993), 44pp ISBN 1-898079-10-2; Western Generals: The Dangers from British and American Military Success, Briefing A/2 (Prodem, School of Business and Economic Studies, University of Leeds, April 1994), 53pp ISBN 1-898079-20-X; Military Adventurism: Learning From the Past – Looking to the Future, Briefing A/3 (SBES, University of Leeds, October 1995), 79pp ISBN 1-898079-25-0. All available through Legal Deposit libraries in the UK and Ireland.

Nuclear Crisis Alert – Amber warning (11 September 2014) available at www.directionofconflict.org

Prodem legal cases, *Southwood & Parsons v HM Attorney General*, (9 October 1998 and 28 June 2000) may be found on the BAILII website or at www.ipp2000.org/ipplaw.html

See also:

Diego Lopes da Silva, Nan Tian and Alexandra Marksteiner, 'Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2020', SIPRI Fact Sheet (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, April 2021), Table 1, p.2.

Hans M. Kristensen and Matt Korda, 'World Nuclear Forces' in SIPRI Yearbook 2021: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2021), Chapter 10, pp. 369-71.

International Institute for Strategic Studies, The Military Balance 2021, (Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group for The IISS, February 2021),