

# EU coercive armed force coming in?

Last month, I read in the Italian media that the Commission wants to beef up Frontex – the EU's border guards corps, and send them to places like Greece, or any other member state (presumably within Schengen) – **even against the will of that member state**. This is confirmed by the statement by the Swedish Interior Minister admitting as much in this article.

The frontier guards will of course be equipped with lethal weapons and will operate under the EU's own flag, and be answerable only to Brussels.

It should be realised that their presence on the territory of a nation-state will therefore amount to a military occupation of that nation-state.

Once a bridgehead has been thus established by Brussels with the stationing of EU frontier guards in a member state, on the excuse that the state in question is unable to control its own frontiers, the road will be open for the European Gendarmerie Force to move in too.

The “United State of Europe” that the EU wants to build will clearly be based on the model of the centralised Napoleonic State, where the enforcers – i.e., the police – are always paramilitary, lethally-armed, and directly controlled by the central government. Thus their personnel are recruited nationally and then redeployed all over the territory, most usually not in their home towns, and housed locally in barracks. Thus, for example, the French *Gendarmerie* controls France, the Spanish *Guardia Civil* controls Spain, and in Italy there are three such bodies, the *Carabinieri* (military police), the *Polizia di Stato* (State Police), and the *Guardia di Finanza* (tax police – also militarised), all deployed all

over the territory and each answerable to a cabinet minister (respectively, Defence, Interior, and Finance). Each nation is in effect under military occupation by its own central government. The machinery for a despotic form of government is thus pre-arranged, and readily available to a despot, when and if one comes along (as has happened all too frequently in European history).

So, likewise following the Napoleonic model, the United States of Europe is to have the *Eurogendarmerie* to control its own territory – ie the territories of what were once the nation-states. The embryo EuroGendarmerie Force (EGF), comprising the militarised police forces of six member states so far, is already up and running. If any should not believe it they can see the EGF's own official website – [www.eurogendfor.eu](http://www.eurogendfor.eu).

Compare and contrast to our British system, with 43 independent local constabularies, traditionally unarmed policemen, the concept of "policing by consent", and so forth... Our system is designed to provide an obstacle to despotic forms of arbitrary government. We are the heirs to Magna Carta, which limited of the powers of the State over the people, while our continental brethren got the Inquisition instead, which expanded and deepened these powers.

I also read in the Italian media of renewed calls for the establishment of a European Public Prosecutor (EPP). This figure is the centrepiece of the *Corpus Juris* project, and he will be armed with fearsome powers of **arbitrary arrest on no evidence and lengthy (months, or more) imprisonment without any public hearing**. (These powers are already – and have always been – enjoyed by continental judiciaries, as British victims of the Euroean Arrest Warrant have been discovering to their bitter cost). The EPP will be the creature of the Commission who will doubtless nominate him, and the Commissioners may then, if they feel so inclined, use him to put away awkward people on trumped-up charges (quite easy since there is no need to exhibit any hard evidence for

months, while the suspect languishes in jail...).

Of course Britain is not a member of Schengen and so our own government will doubtless tell us, smugly, that none of this need concern us.

However, if all of this has not yet come to pass, it is precisely because Brussels is aware that there is and there would be very strong opposition from the UK. They perceived this clearly from the negative reaction of Britain's Parliament to the *Corpus Juris* proposal when it was first put on the table in 1999.

They realise that they cannot push this forward unless and until they have Britain locked into a position where we cannot say No.

They will now have this opportunity if the IN votes carry the referendum. For with a quisling, or at best a wavering, Cameron still in the saddle, clearly all British resistance to complete political, and legal, and indeed military, unification will be swept aside. They will say "THIS IS WHAT THE BRITISH PUBLIC WANTS AND VOTED FOR".

Yet so far, the public is completely unaware of this precise threat to our democracy and to the personal freedom of each and every one of us, if the IN vote should carry the day. People think it is all merely about money, and prosperity. Yet was it not Jefferson who said "If a nation hands over its freedom in exchange for a perceived economic advantage, it will surely end up losing both"...?

It would be a tragedy if the vote was taken with voters in complete ignorance of these catastrophic consequences that an IN vote would unleash upon us.

At present, hardly anyone has any idea at all of these consequences. As far as I am aware, not one of the "leave" campaigning organisations has put these themes on the agenda.

Should not these matters be aired, and brought to the attention of the public, in good time before the vote?