

Crime Report

January 2009

Allegations

We assert that the former and current Prime Minister, the former and Current Attorney General, members of the Cabinet, Members of both Houses of Parliament, civil servants, military commanders, law officers, advisors, journalists and taxpayers have violated the laws of war and committed war crimes against the people of Iraq and Afghanistan:

By planning, taking part or supporting the illegal invasion and occupation of Iraq and the unlawful armed military action in Afghanistan causing the deaths of 1,000,000 men, women and children, British citizens violated the laws of war and committed crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, conduct ancillary to these crimes, crimes against peace, complicity in a crime against peace, murder, conspiracy to murder, incitement to murder and other indictable offences under domestic and international war law.

Facts

In April 2002 the former Prime Minister of Great Britain [Tony Blair] decided to form a Coalition with the United States of America to greatly increase the number and ferocity of armed attacks against the State of Iraq with the intention of removing the regime of Saddam Hussein and destroying Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction¹. Subsequently members of HM Government gave orders for HM armed forces to be deployed to the Middle East in readiness for a full-scale armed invasion of Iraq. In a vote in Parliament on March 18th 2003 412 MPs voted in favour of war knowing that armed attacks by Coalition forces using high-explosive weapons would result in the death and injury of Iraqi citizens. The invasion and occupation of Iraq by Coalition armed forces began on March 20th 2003 causing the deaths of at least 200,000 and possibly 1,000,000 Iraqi citizens and injury to many more.

Multiple war crimes committed against the people of Iraq

We contend that by order of Parliament HM armed forces joined a Coalition of States and took part in the illegal armed invasion and occupation of Iraq in which indiscriminate high explosive weapons such as cruise missiles, rockets, cluster bombs, mortars and depleted uranium artillery shells were used in thousands of attacks against villages, towns and cities in Iraq killing tens of thousands of Iraqi men, women and children. We contend that by setting out to destroy and subsequently killing thousands of members of the Iraqi national group Ministers of State, Members of Parliament and others committed crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, conduct ancillary to such crimes, a crime against peace, complicity in a crime against peace, murder, conspiracy to murder and incitement to murder which are offences under sections 51 and 52 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001, Article 25 of the Rome Statute, Articles VI and VII of the Nuremberg Principles, the Offences Against the Person Act 1861, the Criminal Law Act 1977, the Accessories and Abettors Act 1861, the Landmines Act 1988, the Chemical and Biological Weapons Acts the Geneva Conventions and other international and domestic statutes, as well as crimes in common law and customary international law.

¹ Evidence of these crimes is contained in the Secret Downing St Memo of July 2002, the Secret Legal Advice from the Attorney General to the Prime Minister of March 7th 2003 as well as Cabinet Office Papers and Cabinet Minutes.

The Law

The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

The Rome Statute of the international Criminal Court has been signed and ratified by Britain and not only introduced the universal criminal offences of 'genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes', but set up a permanent international criminal court in The Hague with jurisdiction over these crimes.

The international Criminal Court Act 2001

By enacting the International Criminal Court Act 2001 (ICCA), Parliament ratified this international treaty, introduced the criminal offences of 'genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and conduct ancillary to such crimes' into UK domestic criminal law, and ceded ultimate jurisdiction over these crimes to the International Criminal Court.

OFFENCES UNDER DOMESTIC LAW

- 50 (1) In this part**
"genocide" means an act of genocide as defined in Article 6,

ARTICLE 6 **Genocide**

For the purpose of this Statute, "genocide" means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such (a) killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part..."

51 Genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes

- (1) It is an offence against the law of England and Wales for a person to commit genocide, a crime against humanity or a war crime.**
- (2) This section applies to acts committed –**
(a) in England or Wales, or
(b) outside the United Kingdom by a United Kingdom national, a United Kingdom resident or a person subject to UK service jurisdiction.

52 Conduct ancillary to genocide, etc. committed outside jurisdiction

- (1) It is an offence against the law of England and Wales for a person to engage in conduct ancillary to an act to which this section applies.**
- (2) This section applies to an act that if committed in England or Wales would constitute -**
(a) an offence under section 51 (genocide, crime against humanity or war crime), or
(b) an offence under this section, but which, being committed (or intended to be committed) outside England and Wales, does not constitute such an offence.

The Crimes

The genocide of the people of Iraq

By using high-explosive, indiscriminate weapons against targets in Iraq, American and British armed forces intentionally caused the deaths of at least 200,000 and possibly 1,000,000 Iraqi citizens. The grounds for describing these deaths as intentional [as defined in Article 66.3(a) of the Act] are that officers of HM forces, gave orders to fire such weapons, knowing that by their design the explosive power of these weapons when detonated or hitting the target would result in the deaths of individuals within the vicinity of the explosion; and that this awareness of the mortal consequences of their actions on Iraqi citizens constituted "intent to destroy members of a national group" and as such is a crime of genocide.

66 Mental element

(3) For this purpose

(a) a person has intent –

(i) in relation to conduct, where he means to engage in the conduct, and

(ii) in relation to a consequence, where he means to cause the consequence or is aware that it will occur in the ordinary course of events; and

(b) "knowledge" means awareness that a circumstance exists or a consequence will occur in the ordinary course of events.

50 (2) In interpreting and applying the provisions of those articles the court shall take into account

(a) any relevant Elements of Crimes adopted in accordance with article 9.....

(3) The secretary of State shall set out in regulations the text of the Elements of Crimes referred to in subsection (2) as amended from time to time.

The regulations shall be made by statutory instrument which shall be laid before Parliament after being made.

These relevant Elements of Crimes were adopted in accordance with Article 9 of the Rome Statute on the 4th May 2004 when the Secretary of State [Jack Straw] issued Statutory Instrument 2004 No 1080.

The International Criminal Court Act 2001 (Elements of Crimes) Regulations:

Genocide by killing

- **The perpetrator killed [4] one or more persons.**
- **Such person or persons belonged to a particular national, ethnic, racial or religious group.**
- **The perpetrator intended to destroy, in whole or in part, that national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such.**
- **The conduct took place in the context of a manifest pattern of similar conduct directed against that group or was conduct that could itself effect such destruction.**

Notes [4] The term killed is interchangeable with the term "caused death"

We contend that the perpetrators intentionally killed thousands of Iraqi citizens, members of a national group, by means of high explosive weapons on at least 40,000 occasions since March 20th 2003, and that such conduct taking place in the context of the armed invasion and occupation of Iraq ordered by members of the British and American Governments created a manifest pattern of similar conduct throughout the State of Iraq and as such constitutes genocide by killing.

Evidence of intent to commit **genocide**

We contend that Tony Blair (former Prime Minister), Jack Straw (then Foreign Secretary now Justice Minister), Gordon Brown (former chancellor of the Exchequer and current Prime Minister), Geoff Hoon, John Prescott, current and former members of the Cabinet, Lord Goldsmith and Baroness Scotland the former and current Attorney General and others planned, took part in, condoned the invasion and occupation of Iraq by HM armed forces, causing the deaths of thousands of innocent men, women and children and thereby committed crimes of **genocide** and **conduct ancillary to genocide** under sections 51 and 52 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001 [Britain's gravest criminal law].

55. Meaning of "ancillary offence"

(1) References in this Part to an ancillary offence under the law of England and Wales are to -

- (a) aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring the commission of an offence,**
- (b) inciting a person to commit an offence,**
- (c) attempting or conspiring to commit an offence, or**
- (d) assisting an offender or concealing the commission of an offence.**

(2) In subsection (1)(a) the reference to aiding, abetting, counselling or procuring is to conduct that in relation to an indictable offence would be punishable under section 8 of the Accessories and Abettors Act 1861

Section 8 of The Accessories and Abettors Act 1861 states :

Whosoever shall aid, abet, counsel or procure the commission of any indictable offence, whether the same be an offence at common law or by virtue of any Act passed or to be passed, shall be liable to be tried, indicted, and punished as a principal offender.

Actus Reus

1. Members of Parliament authorised and continue to authorise the war with Iraq and by ordering HM armed forces to join the armed invasion and occupation of Iraq caused the deaths of tens of thousands of Iraqis. Whatever the final number of deaths, they exceed one hundred thousand and therefore meet the first criterion for genocide by killing – **the perpetrator caused the deaths of one or more persons.**
2. The vast majority of the victims were Iraqis. The sole reason for targeting and killing these men, women and children is that they were Iraqis living in Iraq. This meets the second criterion – **such persons belonged to a particular national group.**

Mens Rea

3. That Members of Parliament set out with the intention of destroying part of a national group can be firmly established from their (i) published statements, (ii) choice of conduct [course of action], (iii) their rejection of all non-violent options and alternatives and (iv) their prior knowledge of the mortal consequences of their decisions.

(i) The former Prime Minister [Tony Blair] made numerous assertions over the past four years when being questioned about the war with Iraq that indicate his state of mind and his intentions; "it was the right thing to do", "I had to make a hard decision", "there will be casualties". These and other statements made in TV and radio interviews both prior to and during the conflict confirm that he knew that his chosen course of action (the use of armed force) would cause the death of Iraqis thus demonstrating that he set out with the intention of killing Iraqis. Perhaps none is more telling than the statement made to members of the Armed

Forces at the Basra airbase during his 'farewell' tour of Iraq as reported by Martin Amis in the Guardian of 2nd June 2007 and repeated by Martin Bell in his book *The Truth That Sticks*.

“So we are killing more of them than they kill us..... You’re getting back out there after them. It’s brilliant actually.”

Further evidence of foreknowledge and 'intent' that their decision would result in the deaths of innocent Iraqi civilians is contained in the final two paragraphs of the speech by Jack Straw in Parliament on March 18th 2003 (Hansard Vol 401 No.65 Page 902).

“But as elected Members of Parliament, we all know that we will be judged not only on our intentions, but on the results, the consequences of our decisions... Yes of course there will be consequences if the House approves the Government’s motion. Our forces will almost certainly be involved in military action. Some may be killed; so too, will innocent Iraqi civilians... I urge the House to vote with the Government tonight.”

This statement shows that Jack Straw intentionally engaged in an action which he knew and understood would lead to the deaths of innocent Iraqis. In law, this is evidence that he intended to destroy, in whole or in part, the Iraqi national group as such. Coming as it did shortly before the armed attacks took place, it is also evidence of the crimes of 'aiding and abetting murder', 'conspiracy to murder', 'incitement to murder', 'conduct ancillary to genocide', 'conduct ancillary to war crimes', 'complicity in a crime against peace', 'conspiracy to commit genocide', 'conspiracy to commit a crime against humanity', 'conspiracy to commit war crimes', 'conspiracy to commit a crime against peace', 'incitement to commit genocide', 'incitement to commit a crime against humanity', 'incitement to commit war crimes' and 'incitement to commit a crime against peace'. This is probably the clearest piece of evidence of 'incitement to commit a crime' ever obtained from a British Minister of State.

(ii) Both the former and current Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet chose to wage war and to use armed force in the certain knowledge that Iraqis would be killed. Although they had at least 100 peaceful legal options open to them such as negotiating peacefully, continuing with the UNMOVIC weapons inspections, continuing the destruction of Iraq's long range rockets, allowing the UN Security Council to find a peaceful solution, withdrawing totally from involvement with Iraq, disabling Iraq's military communications systems, instigating anti-government sanctions, continuing UN sanctions etc., they chose to pursue the illegal action of waging a war of aggression in the certain knowledge that the consequence would be injury and death to thousands of Iraqis. When a person is faced with a number of alternative courses of action and then deliberately chooses to pursue the path of death and destruction over the numerous paths of life, negotiation and assistance their free choice of the course of action that will result in causing death proves 'intent to kill'. Just as with the bombings in London, Birmingham and Omagh, where the IRA attacked targets in Britain knowing that British citizens would be killed and injured, so UK Ministers of State ordered armed attacks on villages, towns and cities in Iraq and Afghanistan using high explosive lethal weapons knowing that thousands of members of the Iraqi and Afghan national groups would be killed and injured.

A person only chooses to use a cruise missile if they intend to kill people in the vicinity of the explosion; a person only chooses to use cluster bombs [an indiscriminate weapon of mass destruction containing up to 256 bomblets] if they intend to kill large numbers of men, women and children within three kilometres of the target; if a person chooses to use depleted uranium tipped artillery shells with a half life of four thousand years knowing that it will cause birth defects, cancers, deformities and miscarriages it demonstrates their intention to ***“cause serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group and deliberately inflict on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in***

part. Any person who makes the deliberate choice to use weapons of this nature does so with the intention of killing large numbers of people. If Ministers and other offenders had wanted to forcefully disarm or temporarily disable Iraqi nationals they could have ordered the use of tear gas or tazers or other non fatal options. Their choice of these weapons demonstrates their 'intent' to destroy part of the Iraqi national group – to commit genocide.

(iii) Further evidence of Ministers' intent to kill is provided in the Secret Legal Advice from the Attorney General to the former Prime Minister of March 7th 2003 [2 weeks in advance of the invasion]. In the final section of his legal advice, the Attorney General draws attention to the potential legal consequences of going ahead with the war.

“You will wish to take account of the ways in which the matter might be brought before a court... Two further, though probably more remote possibilities are an attempted prosecution for murder on the grounds that the military action is unlawful and an attempted prosecution for the crime of aggression. Aggression is a crime under customary international law which automatically forms part of domestic law...”

The Attorney General points out the possibility of facing prosecution for 'murder' and 'aggression'. This means that two weeks before the debate in Parliament, both Tony Blair and the Attorney General knew full well that waging a war of aggression with Iraq was a crime and that by killing innocent Iraqis they would be committing murder.

These three sections of evidence meet the third of the criteria for genocide by killing and make it clear that **the perpetrator intended to destroy, in whole or in part, the Iraqi national group as such.**

4. In relation to the fourth criterion for genocide by killing - **The conduct took place in the context of a manifest pattern of similar conduct directed against that group or was conduct that could itself effect such destruction.** The conduct, the UK government's policy of waging war with Iraq and using armed force in attacks against Iraqi conscripts and civilians was repeated on at least 40,000 occasions across Iraq and was thus **a manifest pattern of similar conduct directed against the group.** In addition every armed attack in which weapons were used against 'insurgents', 'conscripts', 'enemy forces', Iraqis or 'freedom fighters' during the invasion and armed occupation was designed to kill people in the vicinity and as such was **conduct that could itself effect such destruction.**

British citizens committed genocide and conduct ancillary to genocide

We assert that by making public and private statements in support of the war with Iraq, by voting in Parliament in favour of armed action, by condoning the actions of the Prime Minister, by paying tax, by taking part in debates, agreeing in Cabinet to Government policies and supporting orders to conduct armed attacks against Iraq and by providing assistance with the invasion and occupation of Iraq in the knowledge that innocent men, women and children would be killed, Members of Parliament and others did aid, abet, counsel and procure the commission of genocide against the Iraqi people and as accessories to genocide are liable to be tried, indicted and punished as principal offenders for crimes under sections 51 and 52 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001.

We also contend that the conduct of The Prime Minister Gordon Brown, the Minister of justice Jack Straw, Peter Lilley, Baroness Ashton, Ann Main and others in commanding, HM armed forces to attack Iraqi citizens constitutes a crime of genocide under Articles 6 and 25 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (RSICC) rendering the offenders criminally responsible and liable for punishment for such a crime within the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court.

Article 25
Individual criminal responsibility

3. ***In accordance with this Statute, a person shall be criminally responsible and liable for punishment for a crime within the jurisdiction of the Court if that person:***
- (a) ***Commits such a crime, whether as an individual, jointly with another or through another person, regardless of whether that other person is criminally responsible;***
 - (b) ***Orders, solicits or induces the commission of such a crime which in fact occurs or is attempted;***
 - (c) ***For the purpose of facilitating the commission of such a crime, aids, abets or otherwise assists in its commission or its attempted commission, including providing the means for its commission;***
 - (d) ***In any other way contributes to the commission or attempted commission of such a crime by a group of persons acting with a common purpose. Such contribution shall be intentional and shall either:***
 - (i) ***Be made with the aim of furthering the criminal activity or criminal purpose of the group, where such activity or purpose involves the commission of a crime within the jurisdiction of the Court; or***
 - (ii) ***Be made in the knowledge of the intention of the group to commit the crime;***

We assert that the actions of HM armed forces in using indiscriminate weapons such as cruise missiles, rockets, cluster bombs and depleted uranium shells against targets in built up areas in Iraq, in the knowledge that such attacks would kill Iraqi men, women and children constitutes genocide as defined in Articles 6 and 25.3(a) of the RSICC and as such renders the aforementioned leaders and commanders criminally responsible for ordering, soliciting and inducing such a crime, which itself is a crime under RSICC Article 25.3(b).

Article 27
Irrelevance of official capacity

1. ***This Statute shall apply equally to all persons without any distinction based on official capacity. In particular, official capacity as a Head of State or Government, a member of a Government or parliament, an elected representative or a government official shall in no case exempt a person from criminal responsibility under this Statute, nor shall it, in and of itself, constitute a ground for reduction of sentence.***
2. ***Immunities or special procedural rules which may attach to the official capacity of a person, whether under national or international law, shall not bar the Court from exercising its jurisdiction over such a person.***

Article 28
Responsibility of commanders and other superiors

In addition to other grounds of criminal responsibility under this Statute for crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court :

- (a) ***A military commander or person effectively acting as a military commander shall be criminally responsible for crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court committed by forces under his or her effective command and control, or effective authority and control as the case may be, as a result of his or her failure to exercise control properly over such forces, where :***
 - (i) ***That military commander or person either knew or, owing to the circumstances at the time, should have known that the forces were committing or were about to commit such crimes; and***
 - (ii) ***That military commander or person failed to take all necessary and reasonable measures within his or her power to prevent or repress their commission or to submit the matter to the competent authorities for investigation and prosecution.***

The Nuremburg Law

[The duty to refuse to take part in or assist the state in waging illegal war]

1. We submit that every human being has a duty in international law under the Nuremburg Principles to refuse the orders, commands and laws of a State where that State is in violation of the laws of war.
2. As the world's first major war crimes trial, the Nuremburg Tribunal provided the principles and tenets that now form the basis of customary international war law. In 1946 Germany's leaders were convicted of crimes against peace and humanity for waging wars of aggression against eleven nation states in violation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact. The judgement highlighted the principles governing conflict between nations, and highlighted the responsibilities of individuals in preventing war.

“After the signing of the Pact, any nation resorting to war as an instrument of national policy breaks the Pact. In the opinion of the Tribunal, the solemn renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy necessarily involves the proposition that such war is illegal in international law; and that those who plan and wage such a war with its inevitable and terrible consequences are committing a crime in so doing...”

It was submitted that international law is concerned with the action of sovereign states, and provides no punishment for individuals; and further, that where the act in question is an act of state, those who carry it out are not personally responsible, but are protected by the doctrine of the sovereignty of the State. In the opinion of the Tribunal, both these submissions must be rejected. That international law imposes duties and liabilities upon individuals as well as upon States has long been recognised...

The very essence of the [Nuremburg] Charter is that individuals have international duties which transcend the national obligations of obedience imposed by the individual State. He who violates the laws of war cannot obtain immunity while acting in pursuance of the authority of the State, if the State in authorising action moves outside its competence under international law...

That a soldier was ordered to kill or torture in violation of the international law of war has never been recognised as a defence to such acts of brutality, though, as the Charter here provides, the order may be urged in mitigation of the punishment. The true test, which is found in varying degrees in the criminal law of most nations, is not the existence of the order, but whether moral choice was in fact possible...

3. The Nuremburg and Tokyo War Crimes Trials were the first occasions in modern history when political leaders were held to account for their crimes in court. The essence of the trials was that individual political, civil and military leaders and officials could not shelter behind their duty to the state, when the state was in breach of international law. As both Germany and Japan had ratified the Kellogg-Briand Pact, their leaders, by breaching the Pact, had committed serious crimes for which they were personally responsible and for which they were convicted and punished.
4. The reason why the Nuremburg trials are important is that they provide the first example of the rule of international war law in action and the judgment gave a lucid account of the laws against war and the principles which underpin relations between states. The International Law Commission then used the Nuremburg judgment as the basis for the statutory laws against war agreed by the UN General Assembly which were entitled the Nuremburg Principles in recognition of their source.
5. The single most important legal development derived from the Nuremburg judgment is the focus on the responsibility of the individual in matters of international warfare. Those responsible for waging war are to be held to account in court. This is reflected in English law in Article 24 Section VI of the Manual of Military Law which states:-

“24. If a person who is bound to obey a duly constituted superior receives from the superior an order to do some act or make some omission which is manifestly illegal, he is under a legal duty to refuse to carry out the order and if he does carry it out he will be criminally responsible for what he does in doing so.”

This law applies to every adult British citizen and is not confined to members of the Armed Forces. It applies to civil servants, police officers, law enforcement authorities and taxpayers.

6. Until 1946 national leaders such as Kaiser Wilhelm or Napoleon Bonaparte who were responsible for waging wars causing the deaths of millions had escaped the ultimate penalty for their crimes. Furthermore, the Nuremberg judgement made it clear that it was not only Heads of State that could be indicted, but all those individuals who together were responsible for planning, supporting, condoning, funding or taking part in aggressive war. This is also reflected in English law in Article 25 of Chapter VI of the Manual of Military Law which states:-

“25. The privileges of Parliament do not apply to criminal matters and the members of either House are subject to the same rules regarding criminal responsibility as any other citizen with the exception that they cannot be made criminally responsible in the ordinary courts for anything said by them while in their places in Parliament when it is sitting.”

7. The Nuremberg Principles became international statute criminal law when they were adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1950. As these seven principles are the world's primary international laws against war, it is the duty of every citizen of Member States of the United Nations to uphold and abide by these laws.

I. Any person who commits an act which constitutes a crime under international law is responsible therefor and liable to punishment.

II. The fact that internal law does not impose a penalty for an act which constitutes a crime under international law does not relieve the person who committed the act from responsibility under international law.

III. The fact that a person who committed an act which constitutes a crime under international law acted as Head of State or responsible Government official does not relieve him from responsibility under international law.

IV. The fact that a person acted pursuant to order of his Government or of a superior does not relieve him from responsibility under international law, provided a moral choice was in fact possible to him.

V. Any person charged with a crime under international law has the right to a fair trial on the facts and law.

VI. The crimes hereinafter set out are punishable as crimes under international law:

(a) Crimes against peace:

- (i) Planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances;*
- (ii) Participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the acts mentioned under (i).*

(b) War crimes: *Violations of the laws or customs of war which include, but are not limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave-labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill treatment of prisoners of war, of persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns, or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity.*

(c) Crimes against humanity: *Murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation and other inhuman acts done against any civilian population, or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds, when such acts are done or such persecutions are carried on in execution of or in connection with any crime against peace or any war crime.*

VII. *Complicity in the commission of a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity as set forth in Principle VI is a crime under international law.*

8. We assert that by taking part in commanding the armed invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq citizens and residents of the United Kingdom committed crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity as they are defined under Principle VI of the Nuremburg Principles. This is the same crime [a violation of the Kellogg-Briand Pact] for which Germany's leaders were convicted and hanged at Nuremburg in 1946.
9. We submit that British citizens knowingly handed over taxes to HM Government thereby condoning, supporting and assisting the British Government in waging illegal war against the people of Iraq and as such engaged in a crime of 'conduct ancillary to genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes' and committed a crime of 'complicity in a crime against peace' under Principle VII of the Nuremburg Principles.

Conduct ancillary to genocide committed by law enforcement officers

Finally we must point out that members of law enforcement authorities in Britain [the police, the CPS, the Judiciary, the Attorney General, the Law Officers Department and the Ministry of Justice] have jurisdiction and a statutory duty in both English and International lawⁱ to investigate these crimes and to arrest, charge and prosecute offenders. Repeated refusals to investigate, arrest or detain known genocide offenders [war criminals] for the indictable offences explained above is itself a criminal offence in England and Wales of 'conduct ancillary to such crimes' and renders those members of the law enforcement authorities who repeatedly refuse to investigate the crimes and arrest offenders liable to prosecution in England and Wales under section 52 of the International Criminal Court Act 2001 or in the ICC in The Hague under Article 25 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Both are indictable crimes and both render convicted offenders liable to life imprisonment.

ⁱ The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.