

# What forces do we need to pursue our foreign policy?

Home defence requires the UK to have sufficient mastery of the Channel and neighbouring seas, and of our airspace, to make invasion impossible or unacceptably costly to any potential enemy. We would normally expect NATO support, but having our own forces in place for any sudden initial attack remains vital.

The UK successfully prevented invasion by the Spanish in 1588, and by the French in the Napoleonic wars. These were achieved by sea power. The resistance to German invasion in the last century required air power and sea power, which were deployed successfully. We nonetheless experienced some shelling and bombing at home in the first world war, and major bomb attacks in the Second World War. The airforce had to deal with fighter and bomber incursions on a grand scale, and to combat the development of missile technology with German flying bombs and rockets at the end of the conflict.

Today we therefore need sufficient sea and air power to act as a deterrent to any potential aggressor. We also need the industrial capability to scale up weapons and ship production were we to find ourselves in a larger conflict. In 1939 the UK was ill prepared for what it had to do, but did manage an impressive scale up of its ships and aircraft production to replace heavy losses and expand the fleets and squadrons. Training enough pilots was a bigger issue than building enough aircraft during the height of the battle of Britain.

Offering assistance to NATO requires the ability to project force away from our home base. This in turn necessitates taskforce capabilities, with air heavy lift and sea delivery to transfer personnel and weapons to the battlefield. The UK in 1914 and in 1939 on both occasions got a small professional army exposed on the continent against superior forces. The death rate in 1914 was very high and led to the need to recruit a massively larger citizens army. In 1940 the retreat from Dunkirk rescued most of our stranded army in uncomfortable surroundings with the loss of large quantities of equipment. The lesson from this is to commit in conjunction with allies in ways which improve the odds of success and reduce the likelihood of disaster from exposing too few people to too large an opposing force.

Being able to help our associated territories and countries needs that same ability to project force at a distance and to marshal sufficient force to resist an invasion or to evict an invader as we did in the Falklands. There is a similar requirement to help the UN.

As an island nation the UK will tend to have more continuous need of maritime and airpower. This can be well used in support of others when we need to intervene overseas. The UK has not tended to have a large army in peacetime, but does have a very professional and effective smaller army. We need a credible professional army for all the roles identified. This has been

massively expanded during global conflicts, especially to intervene on the continent where opposing armies were large and well equipped. Now European countries are democracies and part of NATO the world has changed for the better

---

## Parliamentary votes on the EU Withdrawal Bill

The government has won all but one of the votes on the Bill. The most important vote, the one to approve Clause 1 which repeals the 1972 European Communities Act, passed by 318 to 68, as Labour accepted they needed to allow the repeal to permit Brexit.

On Wednesday Amendment 7 passed against the government's wishes. The argument was one of detail, not of principle. Both government and its critics accepted that Parliament is back in charge over Brexit. Both accepted that any UK/EU Agreement which might be reached should be voted on in Parliament. If Parliament is content with such an Agreement it will then need primary legislation to bring it into effect.

So why was there a disagreement at all? The opposition did not accept Ministerial assurances, and wanted to write their own text into the Bill to reflect the common understanding. The government offered to produce a compromise at Report stage, but Parliament wanted to get on with it.

Underlying this fairly technical debate was a series of other agendas. The Liberal Democrats openly seek to delay and disrupt Brexit as they wish to reverse the public decision. Many Remain supporting Labour MPs want to slow down and water down Brexit because they do not really accept the judgement of the people. Practically every Labour MP would like to defeat the government, as that is a usual wish of Oppositions. Conservative MPs who voted similarly can best make their own case as to why they did so.

There is now discussion of the government amendment to place the date of exit in the Bill. I hope the government do continue with this amendment, and work to ensure its passage. I recommend it for a reason which ought to appeal to most MPs, whether Remain or Leave voters. We need the date in the Bill to ensure legal continuity. Parliament passed legislation to notify the EU of our withdrawal under Article 50. That Article makes clear we will leave automatically on 29 March 2019, two years from the letter. It is therefore vital that we have in place a proper legal framework for that event.

Labour MPs now say that we might instead request the permission of the other 27 to stay in the EU for longer, to assist the negotiations. It is difficult to see why we would be able to negotiate a good deal on April 1st 2019 that we had not negotiated in the 2 years since we sent the letter. It is

important not to hold out the idea of delay to slow down the talks. Nor should we assume that the other 27 would all individually consent to the UK staying in on current terms for a further period to try to get a better deal.

This would be a more difficult vote for Labour MPs to oppose, given that it is central to ensuring legal certainty and confirming EU employment law for example in UK law. Given also the enthusiasm of the government's critics for Parliamentary democracy, surely our leaving date is worthy of primary legislation.

---

## **Multiple long postings with attachments**

I have just had to delete a number of these as I do not have time to check them all out.

---

## **School Funding**

I recently met with a number of constituents to discuss school funding. Following the meeting, I took the points raised up on behalf of those attending. I have now received the enclosed reply from the School's Minister:



2017-0055907POGibb

**Rt Hon Nick Gibb MP**  
Minister of State for School Standards

Sanctuary Buildings, 20 Great Smith Street, Westminster, London, SW1P 3BT  
tel: 0370 000 2288 [www.education.gov.uk/help/contactus](http://www.education.gov.uk/help/contactus)

Rt Hon John Redwood MP  
House of Commons  
London  
SW1A 0AA

7 December 2017

*Dear John*

Thank you for your letters of 25 October and 21 November, addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, enclosing correspondence from your constituent,

regarding school funding. Your email was passed to this Department and I am replying as the Minister of State for School Standards.

The Government is determined to create a country that works for everyone. We are delivering on our promise to reform the unfair, opaque and outdated school and high needs funding systems, and introduce national funding formulae. This historic reform means that, for the first time, school and high needs funding will be distributed according to a formula based on the individual needs and characteristics of every school in the country. Resources will, therefore, be directed to where they are needed most, providing transparency and predictability for schools and local areas.

The introduction of the national funding formulae is supported by significant extra investment. The Government is investing an extra £1.3 billion in schools and high needs over the period 2018-19 and 2019-20, over and above the budget set at the Spending Review in 2015. Core funding for schools and high needs will rise from almost £41 billion in 2017-18 to £42.4 billion in 2018-19 and £43.5 billion in 2019-20. This will allow us to maintain school and high needs funding in real terms per pupil for the next two years.

We have undertaken wide ranging consultations which have allowed us to hear from, and carefully consider, over 26,000 individual respondents and representative organisations. As a consequence of the proposals in our consultation, and supported by our significant additional investment, the national funding formula will:

- Increase the basic amount of funding that every pupil will attract.

- Recognise the challenges of the very lowest funded school, by introducing a minimum per pupil funding level. In 2019-20, all secondary schools will attract at least £4,800 per pupil, and all primary schools will attract at least £3,500 per pupil. In 2018-19, secondary schools will attract at least £4,600, and primary schools £3,300.
- Provide a cash increase in respect of every school and every local authority area from April 2018. Final decisions on local distribution will be taken by local authorities, but every school will attract at least 0.5 per cent more per pupil in 2018-19, and 1 per cent more in 2019-20, compared to its baseline.
- Provide significantly larger increases in respect of previously underfunded schools, of up to 3 per cent per pupil in 2018-19 and a further 3 per cent per pupil in 2019-20. The minimum per pupil funding level will not be subject to this gains cap, and so will deliver faster gains in respect of the very lowest funded schools. In Wokingham, schools will gain 2.3 per cent in 2018-19 and 4.4 per cent in 2019-20 as the national funding formula is implemented.
- Protect the funding directed towards additional needs and distribute it more fairly, in line with the best available evidence.
- Provide a £110,000 lump sum for every school. For the smallest, most remote schools, a further £26 million will be distributed through dedicated sparsity funding.

We have published detailed data tables setting out the impact of the formula for each school and local authority in the country, which can be found at: [tinyurl.com/v8gf39ee](https://tinyurl.com/v8gf39ee). Full details of the school and high needs national funding formulae are available at: [tinyurl.com/yatr93an](https://tinyurl.com/yatr93an).

To provide stability for schools through the transition to the national funding formula, local authorities will continue to set their own local formulae which will determine individual schools' budgets in their areas in 2018-19 and 2019-20, in consultation with local schools. The school level allocations we have published are notional allocations only – final school budgets will continue to be determined by local authorities. Schools will be notified of their budgets for 2018-19 ahead of the financial year.

The independent Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) is clear that with our new investment the schools budget will now be maintained in real terms per pupil from this year to 2019-20. This means that the budget for schools will increase to meet both the expected increase in pupil numbers, and inflationary pressures.

The schoolcuts campaign claims that schools' costs are rising faster than their income, and is extremely misleading. It is based on a flawed calculation that takes school budgets in 2015-16, and then calculates the cost pressures on school budgets over four years. However, the website is not clear that this is what it is doing, and it does not reflect that most of these pressures have already been absorbed by schools, at the same time as standards have continued to rise. Schoolcuts has quoted the IFS as saying that schools will face real terms cuts of 4.6 per cent between 2015 and 2019. The IFS is clear that this figure relates to previous years. In line with the Public Account Committee's recommendations, we will be publishing our own estimate of the cost pressures on schools in due course.

With best wishes.

*Tim Mearns*  
*Neil*

---

## What kind of defence policy do we want?

Under Labour and the Coalition the UK made frequent use of its defence capabilities in the Middle East, alongside Presidents Bush and Obama. In the last couple of years the UK has been rightly more cautious about using military force in tense and difficult civil wars, as has the USA.

There has been a general shift in western thinking away from sending in troops to police war torn territory on the ground. Instead smart western weaponry has been used in support of other local and regional forces attempting to influence the outcome of these conflicts. The West has used a variety of manned aircraft, smart bombs, missiles and drones to kill people on the ground and damage property in support of ground forces provided by others.

This development of western policy towards the Middle East is leading to new

thoughts about what kind of forces the West will need in future, as the weapons designers and manufacturers are placing more emphasis on unmanned systems, remote control and robotics. I wish to explore how the UK can respond to these changes.

The first question to answer is what should be the UK's policy aims.

First and foremost must be home defence. By a combination of our diplomacy, foreign policy and military deterrence we wish to keep our islands from military threat. We also need to make sure we have the force needed to defend ourselves in the unlikely event of a threat materialising.

Second comes our contribution to NATO. NATO remains the West's prime mutual defence alliance. The UK wishes to contribute properly to this, and to benefit from the protection the offer of mutual support gives us.

Third, the capability to go to the aid of territories and countries within the UK family, as we had to for the Falklands in the 1980s.

Fourth should be the ability to join international coalitions of the willing in pursuit of UN aims. There will be times when the UK should join forces to resist an invader or to counter the illegal use of force somewhere in the world. As a member of the Security Council the UK has to be willing to contribute to missions where we have the resources and interest to do so.