



BATTEN IN BRUSSELS

EUROPEAN UNION SECURITY STRATEGY

"Britain's historic regiments are being abolished to fit in with the European 'Battle Group' model . . ."

It is a deliberate policy to link Europe's armed forces so closely into a single EU-controlled military entity that they can no longer act independently.

Although a phoney parliament in democratic terms, the European Parliament has nonetheless been instrumental over the years in driving forward some of the main planks of the integrationist project. It is a forum for Europhiles to air their ambitions in order to give them some appearance of democratic legitimacy before they are adopted by the Council and Commission. One example of this strategy is the Draft Report published by the Foreign Affairs Committee in May this year, authored by Karl von Wogau MEP.

The Draft Report is on the "implementation of the European Security Strategy (adopted in December 2002) in the context of ESDP (European Security & Defence Policy)". It identifies the fact that although the European Union is extremely powerful in economic terms it is tiny in military terms and this is seen as an imbalance to be rectified. In the eyes of the integrationists the EU is a political state and the lack of its own powerful military forces is seen as a serious deficiency.

The Report calls for the establishment of a Defence and Security Union, and, although lip-service is paid to NATO, this union would effectively sidestep it. The unstated long-term goal of the integrationists is for single European Union membership of NATO to replace individual member state membership. The Report correctly points out that the threats facing Europe have dramatically changed since the end of the Cold War and their response to this is to see an opportunity for the European Union to develop a military capability.

The Report states that the EU should be able to "defend itself against any aggressor", with or without NATO, and "secure peace in its geographical neighbourhood". To sugar the pill, the humanitarian card is played by stating the need for a military capability in order to "carry

out rescue missions", and "implement humanitarian interventions under a mandate from the UN". This is done to allay the fears of European citizens who might not be too keen on a militarised EU.

It talks of "homeland security" as though Europe were one country, and of "pre-emptive military actions". It takes note of the USA's security strategy, assuming pre-emptive strikes may be necessary to repel attacks and it "Considers . . . that the security policy of the European Union assumes that, while the first line of defence may lie outside the Union, preventative military action is admissible only in the event of an immediate and clearly identifiable threat; emphasises that in taking such action the EU should as a matter of principle seek a UN mandate". So here we have the worst of both worlds: a militarised EU to which we have handed over our defences, but which will only take pre-emptive action to defend itself if the UN gives it the go-ahead.

Under the proposed measures there would be an EU Defence Minister responsible for military matters who would be answerable to the EU Foreign Affairs Minister. Britain would lose control of Foreign Affairs and Defence. But will the Government and Houses of Parliament allow it to happen? It already is happening in terms of how Britain's defences are being organised and armed. Britain's historic regiments are being abolished to fit in with the European 'Battle Group' model, and the military's defence procurement policy is being used to absorb Britain into the European 'military capability'. The Army is forced to buy European manufactured equipment which can be over-priced and inferior, in order to achieve uniformity. The Report calls for a "common market" in defence procurement and the need for member countries' armed forces to have the same equipment and communications, intelligence gathering and joint command systems.

Such synergy makes sense in terms of NATO, but this is not what is happen-

ing here. British membership of a European military capability (army to you and me) will operationally and politically detach Britain from its tried and trusted NATO allies, most notably the USA. It is a deliberate policy to link so closely Europe's armed forces into a single EU controlled military entity that they can no longer act independently. Politically they will be under the control of the EU Foreign Minister. Although the EU already has a de-facto Foreign Minister in Javier Solana, it doesn't yet have the Common Foreign Policy as contained in the proposed European Constitution. However, the Report has a solution to that problem: the Report "Highlights that most of these points are covered by Constitutional Treaty and that it is therefore of high importance that its ratification should be given a new chance in 2007".

No one in Britain can say we have not been warned exactly where the EU is heading.

Gerard Batten is a UK Independence Party MEP for London. He is a member of the European Parliament's Security and Defence Committee and UKIP spokesman on Security and Defence.

E-mail:
gerard.batten@europarl.europa.eu
 Web site:
www.gerardbattenmep.co.uk

**MEET THE
 BETTER OFF OUT
 TEAM
 at the
 UK Independence Party
 Conference**

7-8 October 2006
 Telford International
 Conference Centre