Europe’s New Foreign Policy Leader: What Role in Nonproliferation?

Baroness Catherine Ashton of Upholland was not the most likely pick to become the European Union’s (EU) new foreign policy chief, but she may be the best-suited individual for the job. On November 19, 2009, 27 European Council leaders appointed Lady Ashton as EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. Lady Ashton was among those most surprised that she had been catapulted into the post, which includes wide-ranging policy-making powers, a large annual budget, and, in the future, a worldwide staff in the form of a European diplomatic corps. She assumed her position on December 1, 2009, the date the Lisbon Treaty entered into force (see textbox). Initially it seemed that weapons of mass destruction (WMD) nonproliferation would be a back-burner issue under Lady Ashton. Going before the European Parliament for her hearing to become Vice President of the European Commission in January 2010, however, Lady Ashton made it clear that preventing the proliferation of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons to states and non-state actors will continue to be a top priority for the EU. Further, it appears that Europe’s foreign policy czarina possesses a skill-set that matches well the EU’s most important role as a force for WMD nonproliferation: to be a multilateral, momentum-increasing, and capacity-building entity that seeks long term solutions to WMD proliferation challenges.

The Lisbon Treaty: Since 2001, efforts to make the EU “more democratic, more transparent and more efficient” led to failed attempts to ratify a new constitution. After ratification by the 27 member states, however, the Lisbon Treaty took effect on 1 December 2009. This marked significant changes to EU governance, but amended rather than replaced the previous Maastricht Treaty, Treaty of Rome, Treaty of Amsterdam, and Nice Treaty. The Lisbon Treaty aims to create a more streamlined EU, although opponents perceive it as an attempt to threaten national sovereignty. In terms of new leadership, implementation of the Treaty includes the institution of President of the European Council, a two-and-a-half year office replacing the system of rotating national presidencies. Also, a new post of High Representative combines the jobs of the foreign affairs supremo and the external affairs commissioner in an attempt to create a more coherent EU foreign policy. Importantly, in order to increase EU solidarity, the Treaty removes national vetoes in some areas, including climate change, energy security and emergency aid, while maintaining unanimity requirements for tax, foreign policy, defense, and social security decisions. Potential provision of civilian and military resources is also possible, although these would officially remain under state control. Other technical changes include greater involvement of national parliaments, institution of citizens’ initiatives, consolidation of the EU legal personality, further citizens’ rights guaranteed through the Charter of Fundamental Rights, a smaller European Commission, a redistribution of voting weights among member states, and new powers for the European Commission, Parliament, and Court of Justice. [1]
Initial statements raised questions on nonproliferation priority

The threat posed by the spread of WMD to state and non-state actors received little attention from Lady Ashton in the first few weeks after her appointment in mid-November last year. In her first public appearance as EU foreign policy supremo before the European Parliament on December 2, 2009, her prepared remarks left out any mention of nonproliferation. [2] Two weeks later, supposedly having had the chance to catch her breath after being projected to international notoriety overnight, she again failed to note the threat posed by the spread of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons. In an article published in one of Britain’s major newspapers, Lady Ashton wrote that the EU “already speak[s] with conviction and clarity on the major challenges that face” the regional organization’s member states, listing climate change, poverty, conflict, and terrorism, but notably not WMD nonproliferation. [Author’s emphasis] [3]

The exclusion was rather remarkable considering that the latter issue has been a top EU foreign policy priority in recent years. WMD proliferation, for example, was considered one of five key threats facing the continent in the EU’s 2003 European Security Strategy (ESS). [4] That same year, the European Council adopted a strategy to combat the spread of WMD, signaling the issue’s prominence within EU decision-making bodies and its bureaucracy. To ensure the strategy’s effective implementation, Javier Solana, then the High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, appointed Annalisa Giannella to spearhead these efforts. Giannella, a long time European diplomat, further developed the WMD strategy through various initiatives. Since the strategy’s adoption, numerous common positions, regulations, joint actions, council decisions, and action plans have been adopted to implement the strategy.

A recent major addition to the strategy includes the 2008 “New Lines for Action,” which focuses on five major nonproliferation areas: intensifying efforts to counter proliferation flows and proliferation financing, sanctioning acts of proliferation, developing measures to prevent intangible transfers of knowledge and know-how, raising awareness in scientific and academic circles, and financial institutions, and continuing cooperation
with international organizations and third countries to help them improve non-proliferation policies and export controls [6]. The work to achieve the objectives of the New Lines for Action is ongoing and due to be achieved at the end of 2010. The EU’s efforts towards implementing its WMD strategy have also been thoroughly documented in progress reports every six months. It is in this light that Lady Ashton’s near silence on the nonproliferation issue at the end of 2009 seemed out of touch with ongoing progress on one of the EU’s major foreign policy objectives. The 2010 edition of Lady Ashton, however, struck a different tone, although some ambiguities remained.

WMD nonproliferation remains top EU priority...
Returning to Brussels in January 2010 with written answers to a European Parliament questionnaire ahead of her confirmation hearing as Vice President of the European Commission, Lady Ashton unconditionally pledged that she would give priority to the nonproliferation issue. In her responses to the European Parliament she wrote that she intends to “use all the instruments available to strengthen the engagement of the European Union in countering chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear proliferation.” [7] Subsequently, in her opening remarks before European Members of parliament (MEPs) on January 11, 2010, she mentioned nonproliferation first among the thematic issues of priority and said she intended to expand current EU efforts in this area. [8] Other issues representing part of a broader foreign policy and security agenda included counterterrorism, human rights, energy, and climate change.

...but specific remains unclear
Those hoping that Lady Ashton’s presentation to the Parliament would be a Prague-like address à la Barack Obama in April 2009, in which the U.S. President shared his vision of a nuclear weapons free world and mapped initial steps towards such a future, were disappointed. Despite reaffirming the importance of issues concerning WMD and making her personal convictions clear, Lady Ashton’s approach remained vague or she settled for parroting current EU nonproliferation policies. In Lady Ashton’s defense, her appointment as EU’s top diplomat came as a surprise to most observers and to herself, and she could not be expected to achieve detailed familiarity with all the issues in her
portfolio in the short time before her nomination hearing. Additionally, upon assuming her new responsibilities in December 2009, she stated she would order a review of major foreign policy issues, a process in which EU foreign ministers would partake. She did, however, speak to a few of the current challenges the international community faces today as it pertains to nuclear weapons proliferation.

In terms of the Iranian nuclear program, widely suspected by the West to be of a military nature, Lady Ashton reassured MEPs that she was “in close contact with all the relevant actors, including the E3+3” (also referred to the P-5+1; participants include France, Germany, the UK, China, Russia, and the United States). [9] Unwilling to go into greater detail over the Iranian nuclear conundrum, she said imprecisely, “We need to decide on next steps in light of Iran’s refusal to accept its international obligations.” [10] A number of MEPs, however, pressed her on the Iranian issue during the question and answer sessions, asking what action she was prepared to take if Tehran continued to defy international nonproliferation rules. Lady Ashton stated her commitment to the ongoing “twin-track,” recognizing, however, that dialogue “is not an excuse to play for time.” [11] Asked about the prospect of a new round of sanctions against Iran, Lady Ashton deferred by saying such measures would be discussed in the E3+3 framework, as well as in the European Union depending on future decisions in the European Council. [12]

Since her appointment, Lady Ashton has stressed the need for both European and international unity in approaching Iran on its nuclear program. That is easier said than done and her comments after a meeting between EU’s foreign ministers at the end of January reflected the difficulty the EU’s top diplomat is facing. “We just have to wait and see what comes out of the discussions of the Security Council,” Lady Ashton remarked, deferring to the UN executive body. [cite this as Patrick Goodenough, CNSNEWS.COM, January 26, 2010, http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/60404] Several countries, however, continue to reject calls for new sanctions on Tehran, including China, which has veto power in the UN Security Council.

Will Lady Ashton shoulder Solana’s Iran responsibilities?
At the time of writing, no specific details over Lady Ashton’s role in the E3+3-Iran negotiations have emerged. Negotiating with Iran was one of Javier Solana’s defining activities as leader of the EU’s foreign policy efforts. Starting in 2003, when Washington refused to talk to the Iranian regime without preconditions, Solana kept the channels of communications open and ultimately, with the help of other EU member states, was able to bring the United States into the dialogue. A physicist by training, Solana brought to the negotiations, and the EU post in general, a long record of foreign policy experience, having served as both Spain’s Foreign Minister and Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

In contrast, Lady Ashton has endured criticism for lacking a robust background in foreign affairs. Lady Ashton defended herself, however, touting “twenty-eight years of experience of negotiation, of consensus-building and of advocacy.” [13] The record indeed shows major accomplishments in her previous role as EU Trade Commissioner, including conclusion of an estimated €19 billion trade agreement between the EU and South Korea, the biggest such agreement in the regional organization’s history. [Citation: European Union press release, October 15, 2009, http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/09/1523&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en] Lady Ashton has also strengthened the relationship with key EU strategic partners such as China and the United States, and managed to resolve difficult trade disputes with third countries. [Citation: For example, in May 2009 Ashton pushed through agreement with US regarding an EU ban on US beef imports without having to resort to lengthy legal action in the World Trade organization. [Darren Ennis, “Beef catalyst for EU, US trade deals-Ashton,” Reuters, May 7, 2009, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSL7224248] Further, as previous Leader of the House of Lords in the UK, she was instrumental in steering the Lisbon Treaty through that body.

The Iranian nuclear negotiations are among the most complex diplomatic endeavors today, however, and whether she will replace Solana at the helm of those negotiations will ultimately be the decision of the negotiating parties. She does, nevertheless, have perhaps the most important endorsement: that of her predecessor. Asked if he had any
advice for Lady Ashton, Solana responded, “She doesn’t need advice, she knows very well what has to be done and I’m sure she will do it in a very, very good manner.” [14]

NPT, Nuclear Safety and Security, START, DPRK, and Disarmament
Other nonproliferation and disarmament questions from MEPs during Lady Ashton’s confirmation hearing in January focused on the EU’s role at the upcoming Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, the EU’s ability to assist in concluding the ongoing Russia-US Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), and her views on a world free of nuclear weapons. While Lady Ashton did not offer any specifics on how the EU would approach the NPT conference – saying that she needed to discuss that with EU member states – she did express the hope that the regional organization would speak with one clear voice at the meeting in May. She stressed the importance of early and rigorous preparations and expressed hope that nuclear safety and security in line with President Obama’s nonproliferation agenda would be a key component of the deliberations. Lady Asthon’s wishes may come true as President Obama is bringing together over 40 heads of state in Washington, DC in April for a nuclear security summit to address the issue of safe and secure stockpiles of fissile material. It is reasonable to believe that the conversation from this meeting will carry over to the meeting in New York a few weeks later.

Lady Ashton’s call for EU unity at the NPT review conference does not reflect the EU’s historical modus operandi at that venue. EU member states, and previously member states of the European Economic Community, have experienced significant obstacles to speaking with a unified voice at NPT meetings. National ambitions, not regional cohesion, have on multiple occasions defined the EU’s performance at these meetings, as individual EU states have formed coalitions with non-EU member states. [15] Member states have also clashed over the issue of disarmament with non-nuclear EU states criticizing France and the UK for not doing enough to get rid of their nuclear arsenals. Even amid negotiations with Iran in 2004, Sweden, Greece, and Finland openly stated that as long as the nuclear weapon states did not make progress on disarmament, a tougher stance on Iran would be “less credible.” [16]
Lady Ashton did not comment on the Russia-US START negotiations, to which the EU is not party. She also delivered a non-answer on a question concerning North Korea, stating that the nuclear issue in that country is important and that dialogue with strategic partners, including the United States, would be necessary. [17] To her credit, she added that the nuclear issue at hand was not one on which she had yet worked.

Asked by a MEP about the EU taking the lead on abolishing nuclear weapons in light of President Obama’s statements to that end, Lady Ashton recognized it as an important goal, but seemed to weigh her words carefully, likely due to the fact that there are nuclear weapon states in the EU as well as non-nuclear weapon states that rely on extended U.S. nuclear deterrence. While referring to President Obama’s statements on nonproliferation and disarmament as “significant,” she went on to say, “We know that individual member states within the European Union have got strong views and we need to work effectively towards that...At least my background gives you the commitment that I am interested in [disarmament] issues and I’ll do my best, but I’ll try and do it in a way that brings everyone along with me.” [18]

**Her Background: the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament controversy**

Lady Ashton’s involvement in the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament
(CND) in the late 1970s and early 1980s became a considerable point of contention after it was announced that she would hold the EU’s top foreign policy position. During some of that time, she served as vice-chair and treasurer of the CND, an organization that *inter alia* advocates for unilateral disarmament. Asked whether she still believed in the organization’s approach to the issue, Lady Ashton distanced herself by saying, “what was relevant in the 1970s is not relevant now, and I do not believe that that strategy is now appropriate.” In her previous encounter with the European Parliament on December 2, 2009, she was pressed by a UK Independence Party MEP on whether CND had ever received money from the Soviet Union, allegedly funding the organization to weaken the West. “I did not take any money direct from a communist country,” she responded, explaining that 38 percent of the funding in 1983 was collected out on the streets in buckets and therefore not part of the audited money. [19] No conclusive evidence exists supporting claims that Lady Ashton took funds from the Soviet Union or a Warsaw Pact member country during her time affiliated with the CND.

**Stateswoman and fighter**

It is possible that some UK politicians currently in opposition to Prime Minister Brown’s Labor government used Lady Ashton’s appointment and subsequent hearing to raise the CND issue to score political points ahead of the national elections in the UK this spring. The rather aggressive comments directed toward Lady Ashton, however, provided her the opportunity to rise above petty politics and to look and sound like an international stateswoman. One exchange in particular is worth noting:

MEP William Dartmouth from the UK Independence Party asked the following question during Lady Ashton’s confirmation hearing:

Baroness Ashton, you were one of four paid employees of CND, and then treasurer. I don’t apologize for bringing this up because it was not disclosed on your personal details. If your views and those of your CND pals had prevailed, Eastern Europe would not now be free. On the most important foreign affairs and security issue since the Second World War, your judgment has been hopelessly and demonstrably wrong. Are you the Edith Piaf of the [European] Commission? “Nothing, nothing, I regret nothing,” or are you going to recant these views and formally also apologize to those people that you misled?

Lady Ashton responded:
The joy of parliamentary democracy is that you’re entitled to discuss something in whatever way you wish. Isn’t it fantastic, and isn’t it fantastic that as we look across the European Union we have 27 countries engaged through this European Parliament in doing precisely that. It is one of the great joys of my lifetime… I have never hidden what I did, I am not ashamed of who I am and what I’ve been. When I was a young person, I marched because I believed that we should abolish nuclear weapons. You can argue against how I did it, you can’t argue against what I was seeking to achieve and part of what we did was to make sure we made connections with all of the freedom movements across the East… I felt very passionately, we wanted to see a Europe that was free and here we have it. And one of the reasons I want to do this job is to take the values I have held all my life and use them to support the principles that this house is founded upon. [21]

Lady Ashton’s answer was followed by applause in the European Parliament. She had also drawn applause during her previous hearings on December 2, 2009, when she defended herself against attempts by MEPs to belittle her experience. In the European Parliament, MEP Charles Tannock, a British Tory, asked the High Representative why she was chosen despite there being more qualified candidates. “As to why I was chosen,” began Lady Ashton, “it was because 27 heads of government invited me. I may not be your choice but I appear to be theirs, and I will do my best to do the job as best as I possibly can.” [22]

**How did Ashton end up at the helm of EU foreign policy?**

Despite a largely negative reaction to her appointment among European observers – primarily focusing on her lack of foreign policy background [23] – Lady Ashton’s need for on-the-job training is the result of the process through which she was appointed. Her appointment came as a surprise to most, including herself, (she allegedly received the news via text message), and was the result of political horse-trading among Europe’s leading nations. [24] British Prime Minister Gordon Brown initially supported his predecessor, Tony Blair, for appointment by the European Council as the Union’s first president. Former Prime Minister Blair, however, did not have the necessary backing by the Council, which instead unanimously named Belgian Prime Minister, Herman Van Rompuy, for the post. The EU High Representative position was then slated to be filled by the UK. Based on experience, Britain’s current Foreign Secretary, David Miliband, was arguably among those best suited for the job, but Miliband declined Brown’s offer to place him at the forefront of European foreign policy-making. Other potential British
candidates did not gain sufficient support among European leaders. [25] At the same
time, Lady Ashton had the backing of her boss, José Barroso, President of the European
Commission, and European leaders eventually unanimously offered her the job.

It is up to Lady Ashton
A basic framework is in place for Lady Ashton’s new role, but how the position will
emerge and what issues will prevail is largely up to her. Under the Lisbon Treaty, the
position of EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy combines the
former posts of High Representative of the Common Foreign and Security Policy and
Commissioner for External Relations. It is an effort, among other things, to have Europe
speak with a more unified voice in its foreign policy and emerge even more as a global
player. Additionally, Lady Ashton will serve as the Vice President of the European
Commission. She will also focus on establishing an EU Foreign Service – also known as
the European External Action Service, which will consist of about 3000 employees
worldwide. [26] Lady Ashton will also manage a budget of about $6 billion. [27]
Commenting on her new post, Lady Ashton recognized the vague job description: “I do
not have an office, I do not have a Cabinet, I do not have a team,” she said. “I inherited a
blank piece of paper, and at the moment I have written one or two small things on it.”
[28] If she does not assert herself in her role, some observers fear that she may be
undermined by powerful EU member states. “The decisive factor will be the respect that
member states show for the role. [If Ashton] gets rebutted two or three times on high
profile issues…we may have to wait another decade before anything serious changes,”
one commentator said. [29]

Ashton may be exactly what the EU needs
The EU’s most important role as a force for WMD nonproliferation efforts is its ability to
be a multilateral, momentum-increasing, and capacity-building entity that seeks long-
term solutions. [30] The EU’s greatest strength “continues to lie in multilateral settings
where the power of 27 countries moving in the same direction always creates
momentum,” said one prominent European observer. [31] Other commentators raised the
importance of Lady Ashton as a consensus-builder, recognizing that skill set as a key
component necessary to lead the EU’s foreign policy efforts. Daniel Korski, Senior Policy Fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations, writes: “Steps toward greater policy coherence will be crucial if European governments want to have a greater impact abroad than merely through the magnetic pull of EU membership. [President Van Rompuy and Lady Ashton] seem well placed to build consensus for such a system. Chosen unanimously, backed by big and small states alike, and representing both Right and Left, the Rompuy-Ashton team is more likely to bring EU governments, European legislatures and the European Parliament with them, than would have, say, Tony Blair or Massimo D’Alema [other contenders for the job].” [32]

Recent and ongoing nonproliferation efforts for Ashton
Recognizing the sensitivity and immediacy of some of the nonproliferation issues that Lady Ashton will have to confront right away, for example the Iran issue and continued implementation of the WMD strategy, continuity should be a guiding principle when selecting her team. As Lady Ashton conducts her review of the major foreign policy issues, signs will emerge of her emphasis on permanency or change. One key indicator, for example, may be whether she continues rely on Annalisa Giannella for implementation of the EU WMD strategy, or whether she turns to someone else.

A myriad of ongoing EU efforts focus on WMD nonproliferation. These include strengthening both the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), as well as seeking the universalisation and reinforcement of multilateral agreements in the fields of nonproliferation and WMD delivery vehicles. [33] In the past ten years, the European Council has adopted twenty Joint Actions with a view to increasing the impact of, inter alia, the BWC, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO), the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), and UN Security Council Resolution 1540. A number of Council Decisions have also been adopted aiming to achieve entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the strengthening of OPCW, and nonproliferation of ballistic missiles. [34] EU member states have also provided assistance to Russia with a view to helping Moscow meet its
obligations under the CWC, as well as securing its nuclear sites. [35] Further, in 2003, the European Council adopted a nonproliferation clause to be implemented in all agreements with third parties, including trade and other economic measures. Under the terms of the clause, parties agree to, among other things, take “steps to sign, ratify, or accede to, as appropriate, and fully implement all other relevant international instruments” in the area of WMD nonproliferation and to establish effective national export control system. The EU is also a strong supporter of the Proliferation Security Initiative. [36]

The EU’s efforts continue to yield positive results. In recent years, for example, several states have acceded to the CWC, EU countries have contributed financially toward the construction of the Shchuch’ye chemical weapons destruction facility in Russia, and capacity-building efforts in third countries have contributed to implementation of UNSCR 1540. [37] With regard to the CTBT, the EU has focused on training monitoring staff and upgrading equipment in order to strengthen the monitoring system’s ability to detect nuclear tests worldwide and hence increase its credibility. [38] A top EU diplomat working for Solana when he was in office, said that the EU’s outreach emphasis has been on Annex II countries, particularly China, which has yet to ratify the CTBT. Furthermore, with regard to financial support for various WMD nonproliferation activities, under the Commission’s “Instruments for Stability,” £51.5 million has been allocated since 2007 “to projects combating proliferation of material that may be used in WMD, including fighting illicit trafficking, increasing bio safety and bio security, and supporting the redirection of scientists previously involved in WMD activities.” [39] An additional example of EU activity in nonproliferation includes the aforementioned, ongoing implementation of the New Lines for Action. The successful implementation of the New Lines for Action will, to a large extent, depend on Lady Ashton’s ability to acclimatize to her new job successfully.

**Conclusion**

Immediately after her appointment, Lady Ashton admitted that she needed to “increase [her] understanding of what we need to do and how to do it.” [40] When pressed on why
she was unable to provide more precise answers to foreign policy questions she said she would come back with “considered” responses at a later time. On multiple occasions during her two hearings before the European Parliament, she also joked with the MEPs drawing laughs from her audience. Her soft-spoken approach and humble demeanor should, however, not be confused with being unable to stand tough and respond to hostility. This was, as noted above, showcased during multiple recent occasions as Lady Ashton fought back against her critics who charged that she was not fit to serve as the EU’s top diplomat.

Despite some criticism over not traveling to Haiti immediately after the earthquake that devastated that country, Lady Ashton’s first few weeks in office showed signs of balancing the roles of taking command of a largely undefined role and establishing herself as a leader of a new office. At the same time she has demonstrated sensitivity to the issue that other EU bodies and individual states must feel they will be actively included and consulted in the process of filling the new position with content. Looking ahead, the EU will continue to position itself as a global player. Lady Ashton’s portfolio will include a diverse number of issues, for example, energy security, illegal immigration, climate change, regional conflicts, EU enlargement, terrorism, and heading the EU’s response to international catastrophes, such as the one in Haiti. Nonproliferation will also be high on that list. Lady Ashton’s most trying time as an EU official, without a doubt, lies ahead of her.
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