

# Peter Southwood MBA, Ph.D (in Peace Studies)

Consultant on the direction of conflicts towards peace (P) or war (W) in the short (S) and long (L) term



11 September 2014.

As a Great Power crisis looms....

# United Kingdom Parliament Seeks to Rewrite History

1. The BBC Radio 4 news at 6.00am on Thursday 31 July 2014 accurately cited this statement from the Recommendations of the Commons Defence Committee report on NATO published that day:

The NATO alliance has not considered Russia as an adversary or a potential territorial threat to its Member States for twenty years. [HC 358, page 4]

The Committee knew this was untrue. The *fact* of NATO expansion eastwards towards Russia during this period contradicts this assertion – irrespective of whether such an expansion is considered good or bad and quite apart from Alliance intentions, which cannot be known with certainty. What is certain is the *fact* of NATO expansion towards the borders of Russia.

2. The Chair of the Defence Committee, Rory Stewart, has defended the statement on the grounds of Standing Order 133. However, this is a 'Power to report opinion and observations' not a power to falsify evidence or to assert as a fact that which the Committee knew or believed to be false. The above statement was not presented as an opinion nor was it in the BBC news report. Yet on the grounds of Standing Order 133 the UK Parliament refuses a demand for re-publication or insertion of an Erratum notice. In analogous manner German nationalists denied the *fact* of military defeat by the Allies in World War 1 and propagated an opinion that the German Army had been "stabbed in the back" by traitors at home. This *great deception* helped pave the way for the eventual collapse of the Weimar Republic and the onset of World War 2.

3. The current crisis between the Ukraine (with NATO support) and Russia was foreseen twenty years ago in an editorial written for the Project on Demilitarisation (Prodem), based in the University of Leeds from late 1993. In the four (out of six) Briefings which Peter Southwood alone edited and most of which he wrote himself, he warned of the consequences of the post-Cold War peace settlement for future peace or war as summarised below:

Date of publication	Briefing	ISBN (pages)	Prediction	Outcome
Mar 1993	No. 1	1-898079-00-5 (69pp)	<b>"We are on the road to war.</b> After the Cold War and Gulf War the next war is just waiting to happen wherever it may be." [Original emphasis]	Global war on terrorism, post- 11 Sept 2001
Sept 1993	A/1	1-898079-10-2 (44pp)	Five "Major War Scenarios" inc. 1. NATO v Russia 2. Ukraine v Russia "NATO now has the capability for military intervention in the former Soviet Union, in the event of a reassertion of Russian dominance, but it would then risk political divisions within its own ranks and a nuclear confrontation with Russia."	NATO intervention in former Soviet Union with risk of nuclear war, e.g. over Ukraine from 2014 on
Apr 1994	A/2	1-898079-20-X (53pp)	Post-Gulf War 1991: "More likely is that eventually Western interests will be challenged by a political crisis which mirrors all the complexity of Bosnia but cannot be sidelinedIf, to cap it all, the scenario involves economic and political instability, ethnic conflict and social and environmental disaster, as most civil wars do, the risk of Western political and military failure would soar"	Iraq, 2003 on
Oct 1995	A/3	1-898079-25-0 (79pp)	Post-Cold War peace settlement after 1980s: "We have sustained a total and unmitigated defeat We are in the midst of a disaster of the first magnitude.' [Cited from Winston Churchill] Exactly the opposite policy [to the appeasement policy of the 1930s], pursued in entirely contrary circumstances, has produced not a 'victory' for the cause of peace but a defeat – perhaps the worst in history. The Soviet Union had broken with the historic tradition of Great Power rivalry leading to war; its reward was a peace settlement that bred resentment and humiliation. The difference this time is that whereas the illusion of Chamberlain's 'peace in our time' was quickly dispelled by the evidence of war the scale of Western failure today, as a result of dispelling the reality of the Gorbachev 'peace offensive', may not manifest itself in a Great Power war for years to come."	To be decided Ukraine, 2014 et sequel?

<u>Note</u>: All Prodem Briefings were sent to the legal deposit libraries of the United Kingdom and Ireland.

Now the significance of Parliament's attempt to leave out the *fact* of NATO expansion eastwards is apparent: Russian "aggression" can be highlighted in Ukraine while the West's "contribution to nourishing the soil in which [new nationalist demagogues] flourished" can be denied. [A/3, p. 44.] This *great deception* necessitates treating another State as we would not wish to be treated ourselves, i.e. rebellion against the laws of God expressed in the *Golden Rule*. For the UK would not wish to see the most powerful military alliance in the world advance towards its own borders.

## Conclusion

The amber warning of a nuclear crisis means that the first tangible signs of a potential, imminent and direct military confrontation between the United States, supported by NATO, and Russia has emerged, with the attendant risk of escalation to the level of threatened or actual use of nuclear weapons.

The basis of the warning is as follows:

- a.) <u>Denial of fact</u>: the UK Parliament's deliberate misrepresentation of *material fact*, which lies at the heart of the Commons Defence Committee's recommendations on NATO, will have a polarising effect on relations with Russia. Thereby Parliament seeks to rewrite the history of how the Cold War ended and why the current crisis has emerged. None of this is consistent with a state of peace.
- b) <u>Undermining the rule of law</u>: the Commons Defence Committee's defence of its conduct puts a higher value on opinion than fact and amounts to a defence of falsifying evidence as being in the national interest. This is inconsistent with the rule of law and, therefore, with a state of peace.
- c) <u>Breach of the Golden Rule</u>: the fact that the NATO States have no intention of engaging with Russia in a conventional military conflict at the present time is not relevant because the last twenty five years have demonstrated that even the most powerful State in the world is not in control of events. Public opinion is powerless in the face of the force of circumstances which are driven in the long term – as four Prodem Briefings illustrated – by the laws of God expressed in the *Golden Rule*. ["In everything do to others as you would have them do to you; for this is the law and the prophets" (NRSV of the Bible).] A state of peace, and the avoidance of another Great Power war, is in the hands of God not humanity who must submit to His laws.

Thus the first and basic question to be answered to resolve this crisis is:

## Who is the supreme sovereign: God or Parliament; His laws or theirs?

The author's forthcoming Briefing on the Iranian nuclear crisis seeks to answer this question and thereby switch the primary focus of human striving for peace from the political to the theological (or spiritual) level.

## Notes

- (i.) The Commons Defence Committee does not include MPs from Irish, Scottish or Welsh nationalist parties nor certain minority parties. However, its Report HC358 was published on the authority of the House of Commons so is deemed to be consistent with UK Parliamentary standards as a whole. Correspondence between the author of this Alert and the Chair of the Defence Committee forms the basis for the statement attributed to him at the start of paragraph 2 above.
- (ii) The Code used in this Nuclear Alert is currently based on three phases:
  - Amber:- Initial alert to a crisis potentially involving the threat or use of nuclear weapons
  - Red:- Crisis involving a high risk of the threatened or actual use of nuclear weapons
  - Green:- Ending of current crisis that had potentially involved the threat or use of nuclear weapons
- (iii) The author of this Alert, Peter Southwood, accepts full and sole responsibility for its contents. Any questions must be submitted to him in writing and may be answered in the same form.