



FINDING BRITAIN'S ROLE IN A CHANGING WORLD

Building a values-based foreign policy



The
**Foreign Policy
Centre**



OXFAM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United Kingdom is preparing for its post-Brexit place in the world at a time when the principles of liberal democracy and the rules-based world order are facing their greatest challenges in a generation. In a fast-changing world with new powers rising, old institutions struggling and future challenges emerging – from AI to climate change – having a clear approach to values in British foreign policy is not just about doing what we think is right or supporting institutions, norms and rules that the UK often played a key role in creating, but also about actively helping to shape the systems the UK will have to work within for decades to come. The UK's standing going forward will depend more on its future contributions to global solutions, rather than relying on past glories. This requires facing up to the ways in which the current international order has entrenched unequal power relations and the UK's own privileged position.

Securing the national interest in an uncertain world will mean helping to set a framework for the international system that can produce mutually beneficial solutions to global challenges in ways that address longstanding disparities in the voice and protection afforded to people around the world. It cannot be achieved through a transactional approach that prioritises short-term, narrowly defined security and economic gains. The UK has an opportunity to articulate a powerful vision for 'Global Britain' that is defined by commitments to human rights, inclusive representation at home and abroad, and making a substantial impact on poverty and inequality. Failure to actively stand up for its values will be seen as a sign of weakness and decline at a time when there is uncertainty about Britain's standing and future role in the world.

This requires a joined-up approach to foreign policy where decisions about diplomacy, trade, security and international development are all equally rooted in the internationalist values of democracy, human rights, free and fair trade and the international rule of law that the UK has long championed. All major policy and spending decisions with an international dimension should be measured against these values. The UK's future role in the world will be determined by the decisions it takes now about trade deals, how and how much it spends on international development, in its responses to violations of human rights and international norms and rules, and by the role the UK plays in multilateral institutions.

As a medium-sized power, albeit one with considerable assets, the UK will need to show it is still willing to work collaboratively with partners, and to creatively and meaningfully use available tools of influence to shape the future direction of the international system and to respond effectively to specific crises and abuses of its values. The scale and scope of the challenges facing the world will require stronger partnerships with existing allies as well as investment in new and different partnerships with countries that share the UK's values.

Key recommendations to the UK Government:

- Agree a 'Global Britain' values statement of the principles underpinning its role in the world.
- Develop a 'Global Britain Test' that assesses the impact of policies against its principles.
- Engage with and reform the multilateral and global institutions the UK remains a part of.
- Defend the independence of DFID, the 0.7% GNI pledge on aid and the focus on reducing poverty.
- Show the UK still has the confidence and stature to stand up for its values by supporting those who defend them, and speaking out and taking action when they are abused.
- Show climate leadership with effective diplomacy for COP26 in Glasgow and more domestic reform.
- Deliver on new financial transparency commitments and further actions on tax havens.
- Improve parliamentary and public scrutiny of new trade negotiations, and ensure Parliament has a final vote on any new trade deals.

CONTENTS

Executive summary.....	1
Introduction.....	3
When times change should we change with them?.....	12
The strategic challenges facing the UK.....	15
New alliances for the 21 st Century.....	19
Making UK trade policy work for all UK citizens, development and the environment	23
Shared security: humans and humanity in national security policy	29
The path to real climate leadership at the Glasgow Climate Summit.....	33
Development and diplomacy are key to Global Britain's success	37
Narrowing the gap – the case for DFID to focus more on tackling inequality	40
A feminist foreign policy: what would it mean for the UK?	44
Putting well-being and the interests of future generations at the heart of foreign policy.....	47
Conclusions and recommendations	51
Photo credits.....	56
Acknowledgements.....	57

INTRODUCTION

Finding Britain's role in a changing world: Building a values-based foreign policy

Adam Hug,¹ Dr Abigael Baldoumas,² Katy Chakraborty³ and Dr Danny Sriskandarajah⁴

The world we are in

Britain steps out into the post-Brexit world at a time of international turmoil. For over a decade liberal democracy has been in decline, as competing authoritarian and populist models have gained further traction in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis that shook confidence in the post-Cold War international order.⁵ Climate change, persistent inequality and rapidly changing technology pose difficult questions to which the United Kingdom will need to find answers. Leaving the European Union does not see the UK 'picking up where it left off' in 1973; rather it finds itself in an environment where global power is more dispersed, and the direction of travel is uncertain. The UK's future standing will depend more on its contributions to global solutions, rather than relying on past glories.⁶ This requires facing up to the ways in which the current international order has entrenched and replicated unequal power relations between countries, as well as the UK's own privileged position.

The UK remains one of the largest economies in the world, the third biggest international aid donor, the sixth highest country in terms of international military spending and a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, as well as a member of the Commonwealth, NATO, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of Europe (CoE) and a host of other international bodies.⁷ The City of London remains a global financial centre, facilitating trillions of pounds in investment. The combination of a significant concentration of international media organisations, world-class universities, major international non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and cultural impact through film, television, music, literature and sporting competitions with a global audience gives the UK a soft-power presence that currently far exceeds its population size or economic clout. The UK has grown used to leveraging its networks to amplify its power, seeking to act as a bridge between the

¹ Adam Hug became Director of the Foreign Policy Centre (FPC) in November 2017. He had previously been the Policy Director at the FPC from 2008–2017. His research focuses on human rights and governance issues, particularly in the former Soviet Union. He also writes on UK and EU foreign policy.

² Dr Abigael Baldoumas is a humanitarian policy advisor for Oxfam GB. She holds a DPhil in Political Science from Oxford University on the role of social movements in shaping public policy in the UK. She has worked in international development since 2012. Her work focuses on forced displacement, gender justice and rights-based humanitarian response.

³ Katy Chakraborty is the head of advocacy at Oxfam GB. She has been at Oxfam since 2009, and as well as political relations work she has played a major role in Oxfam's Even it Up campaign against extreme economic inequality. Her background is in political campaigning and parliamentary advocacy, having previously worked for the Electoral Reform Society, Amnesty International and DeHavilland.

⁴ Dr Danny Sriskandarajah joined Oxfam GB as chief executive in January 2019 from CIVICUS, the global civil society alliance of which he was Secretary General for six years. Prior to that he was Director General of the Royal Commonwealth Society, Interim Director of the Commonwealth Foundation and held various posts at the Institute for Public Policy Research.

⁵ Freedom House, *Democracy in Retreat: Freedom In The World 2019*, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/freedom-world-2019>

⁶ Perceptions of the UK's historic role in the world, both positive and negative, will of course influence how our future actions are perceived by international partners.

⁷ In nominal GDP terms the UK is the 6th largest economy in the world behind the US, China, Japan, Germany and India (see Centre for Economics and Business Research, *World Economic League Table 2020*, December 2019, <https://cebr.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/World-Economic-League-Table-Report-2020-Final.pdf>); This refers to spending compliant with the OECD's rules of ODA (see Donor Tracker: *United Kingdom donor profile*, <https://donortracker.org/country/united-kingdom>). It is worth noting, for example, in relation to aid that China's massive spending on the Belt and Road initiative and other international assistance falls outside of the ODA rules. UK Ministry of Defence, *Finance and economics annual statistical bulletin: international defence 2019*, September 2019, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/international-defence-expenditure-2019/finance-and-economics-annual-statistical-bulletin-international-defence-2019>

United States, the EU and other partners, but now these ties are loosening. The UK has chosen to leave the EU, removing itself from both the occasional strictures of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy and the Single Market; ultimately this will take it out of the rooms where important decisions are made, both in Brussels and in the collaborative processes between EU member state embassies in countries around the world.

At the same time, the UK's other central alliance looks to be at its most fragile at any time in the post-war era. Irrespective of the turbulence of the Trump presidency, the US has been gradually but inexorably shifting its focus to the Pacific and growing more reticent to carry its current share of the burden for European security. The recent escalation between the US and Iran, over the killing of General Qasem Soleimani, highlighted an area where the UK had been trying to forge a different path to Washington before having to hedge its position in the face of US pressure. The extreme polarisation of US political debate has made action on climate at a federal level a partisan issue, limiting the scope for international collaboration.

The number of people living in extreme poverty worldwide has fallen from 1.9 billion in 1981 to 800 million in 2015.⁸ Increased aid and debt relief were a part of this achievement, with the UK standing out as one of the few countries to scale up Official Development Assistance (ODA) over this period.⁹ But in many ways, this has been the easy part, with a huge boost to poverty reduction delivered by the economic growth of China and other Asian countries. Now, 'finishing the job' to eradicate extreme poverty and delivering the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030 will require action to tackle the more structural challenges of climate change, protracted conflicts, and particularly gender and economic inequality – alongside the shrinking of civic and humanitarian space.¹⁰ These are areas where the answers, if they do get to the root causes of poverty, are not always immediately win-win.

The traditional mechanisms of the post-Second World War settlement, from the Bretton Woods Institutions (the IMF and the World Bank) to NATO and the UN system, are all creaking under the weight of institutional inertia, political pressure and lack of public trust. The very idea that a single rules-based international system still exists is in question,¹¹ while the Brexit debate itself drew attention to the potential trade-offs between the benefits of global rules and ongoing democratic accountability at the level of the nation state. Systems based on consensus, such as the OSCE, or with the potential for the use of veto power, such as the UN Security Council, have found their decision-making hamstrung by the growing divisions between key stakeholders protecting their own interests.

Accompanying this are the difficulties the UK faces in extricating itself from the EU and starting to negotiate a new relationship with Europe, highlighting the central role that rules and regulations play in international relations. The ability to trade freely is dependent on the compatibility of regulations and mutual recognition of their implementation. Rules are, however, increasingly being set by regional power blocs, with firms wanting to do business in major markets required to conform to the standards set by these blocs irrespective of their domestic rules and preferences. Russia's efforts to create its own regulatory sphere through the Eurasian Economic Union, and China's attempts to promote integration with its own standards regarding other Asian economies that fall within its gravitational pull, have a clear strategic purpose – extending their political influence and restricting economic opportunities for potential competitors such as the US and EU – in addition to any direct economic benefits. This continued growth of regional regulatory blocs has taken place at a time when attempts to set the rules at a global level have stalled or gone into reverse, as exemplified by the challenges faced

⁸ World Bank estimates are available at <http://iresearch.worldbank.org/PovcalNet/povDuplicateWB.aspx>, based on a \$1.90 poverty line. The most recent estimates for global poverty refer to 2013.

⁹ Deborah Hardoon and Jon Slater, *Inequality and the end of extreme poverty*, Oxfam GB, September 2015, <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/inequality-and-the-end-of-extreme-poverty-577506>

¹⁰ Sustainable Development Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1>

¹¹ Dr Malcolm Chalmers from RUSI argues that 'The UK should cease to promote the narrative that there is one single Rules-Based International System. There is not. Efforts to tackle pressing international problems through collective action are more likely to succeed if they involve coalitions between major powers than if they are only based on rules-based systems that lack clear and binding obligations.' Malcolm Chalmers, *Taking Control: Rediscovering the Centrality of National Interest in UK Foreign and Security Policy*, RUSI, February 2020, https://rusi.org/sites/default/files/202002_whr_taking_control_web.pdf

by the WTO in the wake of the failed Doha round of liberalisation and the paralysis in its trade courts under pressure from the US and other actors.¹²

A brief recent history of values in UK foreign policy

In 1997, the Labour government arrived in office after a Conservative government that had been seen to be slow in responding to the humanitarian crises in the Balkans and Rwanda, and with a development policy that had been tarnished by perceptions of 'tied aid'. Its first Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, set out an approach that has been seen to define the 'values-based' approach to foreign policy. In Cook's landmark speech launching the new Mission Statement for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) in 1997, the term 'ethical' is only used twice and first appears in the line: 'Our foreign policy must have an ethical dimension and must support the demands of other peoples for the democratic rights on which we insist for ourselves.'¹³ This commitment to having an ethical dimension in the FCO Mission Statement was part of a much broader set of objectives promoting multilateralism and internationalism. Yet detractors (and campaigners who wished to create pressure for it to be true) would amplify the 'ethical' claim to argue that the government was aiming for the much harder-to-achieve goal of an 'ethical foreign policy'. As a result, any failure to meet such a standard due to competing priorities, realpolitik or missteps led to cynicism about the UK's intentions. While many of the promises detailed in Cook's speech, such as an annual human rights report, became part of the warp and weft of the FCO's practice, the legacy of Iraq and the response to the War on Terror under Cook's successors saw UK foreign policy fall short of meeting the (mis)perceived goal of an ethical foreign policy.

In 2010, William Hague sought to define the foreign policy agenda of the incoming coalition government, attempting both to move on from the previous Labour government and reassure the public (and their Liberal Democrat coalition partners) that the incoming administration was different to the perception of previous Conservative governments. Hague used the phrase 'enlightened self-interest', and while commercial priorities would grow in importance through the 'Prosperity Agenda', sometimes at the expense of day-to-day human rights priorities, there were signature campaigns such as the leadership in delivering a UN Arms Trade Treaty and the Preventing of Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative.¹⁴

Today the FCO runs the Magna Carta Fund for Human Rights and Democracy, which provides a number of larger grants to support human rights around the world, while smaller and locally focused grant funding is managed by UK embassies and High Commissions in-country. It continues to produce an annual Human Rights and Democracy Report that outlines the government's view of the state of human rights across the world.¹⁵ Protecting the freedom and safety of journalists was a major theme of the FCO under Jeremy Hunt, featuring a joint initiative with Canada. Other key themes that have dedicated delivery teams are the Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative and its work on Freedom of Religion and Belief (with a particular emphasis on persecuted Christians). Under Dominic Raab there has been enthusiasm expressed for utilising 'Magnitsky'-style personal sanctions to tackle individual human rights abusers.

The very establishment of a stand-alone Department for International Development (DFID) in 1997 – coming a few years after aid scandals such as the Pergau Dam affair – was an expression of values in

¹² Jamey Keaten and Paul Wiseman, *World trade without rules? US shuts down WTO appeals court*, AP News, December 2019, <https://apnews.com/a08cc387ff5c1af859e6f17020e29a91>

¹³ Robin Cook, *Mission Statement for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, London 1997*, British Political Speech, <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=292>

¹⁴ Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative, <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/preventing-sexual-violence-in-conflict-initiative>

¹⁵ Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Human Rights and Democracy Reports, <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/human-rights-and-democracy-reports>

foreign policy made manifest in the machinery of government.¹⁶ Followed up in 2002 by the International Development Act, it was established that UK aid must ‘contribute to poverty reduction’. What should have been a tautologous statement has actually been an important backstop against the ever-present temptation from all governments to use the ring-fenced aid budget (0.7 per cent of UK Gross National Income (GNI)) to plug budget holes in other departments. From 2013 to 2019, the amount of UK aid spent by departments other than DFID has risen from 10 per cent to 28 per cent, with the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS), the FCO and Home Office overseeing pots of international aid, alongside the National Security Council, which is responsible for cross-government funds like the Conflict, Stability and Security Fund (CSSF) and the Prosperity Fund.¹⁷ This trend looks set to continue as the current Government seeks to ensure that UK development assistance is deployed in the national interest.¹⁸

The broad consensus in UK foreign policy-making that has persisted since at least the 1990s has supported the idea of a rules-based international order, democracy, free trade, multilateral collaboration and collective security. These are all areas where at times there has been a gap between rhetorical goals and concrete actions, but now more than ever these goals are being challenged both ideologically and in practice.

Britain in the world today

During the Theresa May government, under the guidance of National Security Adviser and Head of the Civil Service Mark Sedwill, there was an attempt to align the whole of government behind its foreign and security policies known as the Fusion Doctrine.¹⁹ There were significant cultural roadblocks to achieving this whole-government approach, as a fusion approach can only succeed if significant work is done consistently at both ministerial and administrative levels to ensure the machinery of government is pointing in the same direction to meet the same goals. This can be even more challenging for a values-led foreign policy, when the short-term priorities (such as securing trade deals or day-to-day security) can seem paramount in the ever-churning political cycle. For example, the Home Office and FCO have struggled to remain on the same page around issues including providing visa access for at-risk human rights activists or allowing experts to attend conferences in the UK. The Home Office has made it hard for family members of those at risk around the world to reach the UK, including those who have worked with the British government as interpreters in war zones or for institutions such as the BBC World Service.²⁰

The phrase ‘Global Britain’ did not appear in the Conservatives’ 2019 Election Manifesto (though the word ‘global’ was used 11 times), but it resurfaced in the Foreign Secretary’s January 2020 remarks on the Queen’s Speech. The Prime Minister has gone further to insist that the UK must be transformed,

¹⁶ World Peace Foundation and The Fletcher School, Tufts University, *The Pergau Dam ‘Arms for Aid’ Scandal*, <https://sites.tufts.edu/corruptarmsdeals/the-pergau-dam-arms-for-aid-scandal/>

¹⁷ Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy; Independent Commission for Aid Impact, *The current state of UK aid: A synthesis of ICAI findings from 2015 to 2019, June 2019*, https://icai.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/The-current-state-of-UK-aid_Synthesis-of-ICAI-findings.pdf

¹⁸ Stephen Bush, *In appointing Anne-Marie Trevelyan, Boris Johnson has completed Theresa May’s revolution*, *New Statesman America*, February 2020, <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/staggers/2020/02/appointing-anne-marie-trevelyan-boris-johnson-has-completed-theresa-may-s>

¹⁹ William McKeran, *Fusion Doctrine: One Year On*, RUSI, March 2019, <https://rusi.org/commentary/fusion-doctrine-one-year>; Owen Barder, *What I Would Like to Hear from the UK Development Secretary: Making the “Fusion Doctrine” Work for the Poor*, Center for Global Development, April 2018, <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/what-i-would-hear-uk-development-secretary-making-fusion-doctrine-work-poor>; UK Government, *Reviewing the UK’s national security strategy: The National security Capability Review and the Modernising Defence Programme*, July 2019, <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt201719/jtselect/jtntatsec/2072/207206.htm>; Reuters, *The fusion doctrine: in an age of terror and hybrid warfare, UK must deploy all capabilities to defeat enemies, says PM May*, *South China Morning Post*, March 2018, <https://www.scmp.com/news/world/europe/article/2139246/fusion-doctrine-age-terror-and-hybrid-warfare-uk-must-deploy-all>; Geoffrey Lyons, *Roundtable: Addressing national security challenges through the Fusion Doctrine*, *Civil Service World*, April 2019, <https://www.civilserviceworld.com/articles/feature/roundtable-addressing-national-security-challenges-through-fusion-doctrine>

²⁰ Eleanor Gruffydd-Jones, *Afghan interpreters’ UK immigration rules ‘anguish’*, BBC News, January 2019, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-wales-politics-46825201>. Information relating to difficulties faced by the families of World Service journalists was raised at a meeting of the London Leadership Council of the Committee to Project Journalists in April 2019.

like 'Clark Kent turning into Superman', upon leaving the EU into a 'supercharged champion' of global free trade.²¹ So, for certain audiences at least, the government's rhetoric is of Britain becoming an enhanced rather than a diminished global player. However, at its heart, the pro-Brexit coalition that helped deliver the Conservative government's large parliamentary majority is founded on two competing visions of Britain's role in the world and openness to it. It brings together both those seeking a retrenchment from globalisation in order to buttress more traditional ideas of community against the pace of change, and the supporters of 'Britannia unchained', a Britain unencumbered by the rules-based constraints of membership of the EU to become even more globalised and open. Balancing the competing interests of this support base going forward will pose a significant political and strategic challenge now that the shared aim of leaving the EU has been realised.

Following the 2019 General Election, the government announced an Integrated Security, Defence and Foreign Policy Review.²² In principle, the proposed review and its stated intention to deliver a more effective, efficient and joined-up foreign policy is a positive step. The authors in the following volume are also arguing for greater policy coherence, but rather than narrowly-defined self-interest setting the policy agenda, they are making the case for a values-based foreign policy. The ongoing debate over DFID's status as an independent department exemplifies the tensions at the heart of 'Global Britain', not least whose interests it will serve.²³ While DFID retained Cabinet representation in the latest reshuffle, at junior ministerial level the merger with the FCO is now complete.²⁴ Multiple reviews have found DFID to be one of the most effective and transparent aid agencies globally, suggesting national security and trade interests rather than value for money or effectiveness are the driving forces behind plans to subsume DFID back into the FCO.²⁵ Evidence to date from Australia, Canada and Norway shows that subsuming aid departments into a single foreign policy department decreases rather than increases global influence.²⁶ Britain's own experience demonstrates the very real pitfalls of misusing development assistance.²⁷ DFID's statutory mandate to fight poverty, its international reputation, and its proven track record in the efficiency and effective delivery of international assistance are essential components of Britain's soft power.

There have been a number of instances where a narrow, security-focused approach to the UK national interest has overridden the stated global values of the UK, such as the increasing use of development aid for promoting UK economic interests, the damaging 'instrumentalisation' of humanitarian aid as a tool to address security concerns – which can muddy humanitarian principles to the detriment of those in need – or the hypocrisy of spending vast amounts of aid money in Yemen whilst selling arms to Saudi Arabia that exacerbate the conflict. Instrumentalising development assistance to deliver narrow, short-term interests will only serve to further undermine what remains of the international rules-based order.

The UK has recommitted to its NATO target of spending two per cent of GDP on defence, but it is as yet unclear what strategic goals it is seeking to achieve. The attitude of Trump and Macron to NATO, combined with the UK's departure from the EU, will strengthen those within the EU that would seek to

²¹ Christo Mitkov, *UK election 2019: the parties' competing visions for Britain's place in the world*, *The Conversation*, November 2019, <https://theconversation.com/uk-election-2019-the-parties-competing-visions-for-britains-place-in-the-world-127890>; Foreign and Commonwealth Office and The Rt Hon Dominic Raab MP, *Foreign Secretary's introduction to the Queen's Speech debate*, January 2020, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/foreign-secretary-introduction-to-queens-speech-debate>; Boris Johnson, *Boris Johnson: Britain must become the Superman of global free trade*, *The Spectator*, February 2020, <https://blogs.spectator.co.uk/2020/02/boris-johnson-britain-must-become-the-superman-of-global-free-trade/>

²² Forces Network, *Boris Johnson Pledges Security, Defence And Foreign Policy Review*, December 2019, <https://www.forces.net/news/boris-johnson-pledges-security-defence-and-foreign-policy-review>

²³ James Landale, *Cabinet reshuffle: International development and Foreign Office merger?* BBC News, February 2020, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-51507273>

²⁴ *Ibid.* 17.

²⁵ ICAI, <https://icai.independent.gov.uk/>; Molly Anders, *UK aid brand at risk from cross-government funds, says IDC report*, Devex, June 2018, <https://www.devex.com/news/uk-aid-brand-at-risk-from-cross-government-funds-says-idc-report-92877>; Publish What You Fund, *The 2018 Aid Transparency Index*, <http://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/the-index/2018/>

²⁶ Abby Young-Powell, *What happens when an aid department is folded?* Devex, December 2019, <https://www.devex.com/news/what-happens-when-an-aid-department-is-folded-96262>

²⁷ From Poverty to Power, *How to stop the Foreign Office gobbling up DFID?*, Oxfam Blogs, January 2020, <https://oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/how-to-stop-the-foreign-office-gobbling-up-dfid/>

position it, rather than the North Atlantic alliance, as the primary coordinating body for European defence and security cooperation, further isolating the UK.²⁸ Similarly, overtures by Macron that would seek to bring Russia further into the fold on European security are unlikely to be seen positively in London in the absence of movement from Moscow on Ukraine and other areas of outstanding concern.²⁹ The UK needs to develop a clear idea of what it believes NATO's role to be, both within Europe and out, and what it wants to do within the alliance. Fatigue with overseas deployment in the wake of Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya persists, and increased Russian belligerence would seem to make a reorientation to European defence a natural move, but existing spending commitments such as the aircraft carrier programme, new cyber-threats and continuing pressures on the public finances may limit the scope for a major reorientation.

The competing pressures on the Government following an election where foreign policy (other than Brexit) barely featured raise questions over whether it has the political bandwidth and institutional capacity to respond to all the challenges it faces. Hosting the UN climate talks (COP26) in November is an opportunity to demonstrate that the UK is still able to lead in multilateral spaces as well as show the character of the UK's leadership post-Brexit. The appointment of Alok Sharma, the new Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy to lead the UK's presidency is welcome, and the UK has a positive story to tell about climate leadership on domestic emissions targets and climate finance to the world's poorest people – but that is not enough.

A successful COP requires strong international diplomacy, effective working relationships with allies, a commitment to putting the voices of those most impacted front and centre, and a roadmap to deliver tangible outcomes. Technological optimism is not enough, and the UK will need to demonstrate a willingness to take hard decisions that deliver global goods at the expense of narrow self-interest. The government will need to show it has the capacity to deliver a successful COP alongside the host of trade negotiations and other agreements necessitated by Britain's departure from the EU.

The UK will no longer be able to easily pool resources with other EU states or automatically expect to have the same level of information-sharing available to its embassies. Worryingly, it has been suggested that UK diplomats have been told to sit apart from their former EU colleagues as a show of independence, potentially straining the interpersonal relationships and restricting the ability to act flexibly that diplomats are likely to need to compensate for lost institutional networks.³⁰ The FCO and other outward-facing government departments are likely to need extra resourcing to build the capacity they will need to act independently, and it is far from clear that this will be a priority for the government. Furthermore, the speed with which the government is pushing for new trade deals with countries outside the EU will make it hard for some of the more value-orientated goals set out in this essay collection to be delivered. Indeed, even when seeking to roll over the terms of existing EU deals there may be pressure to water down the strength of the human rights clauses, with a lack of effective parliamentary scrutiny, as Ruth Bergan and Dr Emily Jones point out in their essay. There are clear questions around whether the UK has the necessary political clout to fight its corner when negotiating environmental protection rules with the US or human rights clauses with countries who do not share our values or where we have short-term financial or security interests, particularly given the political and economic pressure to get the deals signed as the UK loosens its relationship with the EU.

²⁸ Julian Borger, *Trump re-election could sound death knell for NATO, allies fear*, *The Guardian*, December 2019, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/dec/02/nato-donald-trump-second-term>; *The Economist*, *Emmanuel Macron warns Europe: NATO is becoming brain-dead*, November 2019, <https://www.economist.com/europe/2019/11/07/emmanuel-macron-warns-europe-nato-is-becoming-brain-dead>

²⁹ Ian Bond, *NATO: Brain dead, or just resting?* Centre for European Reform, December 2019, <https://www.cer.eu/node/8210/view-email>

³⁰ David Wilcok, *'It's like something from school': Irish leader Leo Varadkar clashes with Dominic Raab over 'petty' order for UK diplomats not to SIT with former EU friends at the international events as they spar over post-Brexit trade*, Mail Online, February 2020, <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7957667/They-not-friends-Dominic-Raab-orders-UK-diplomats-not-SIT-EU-states.html>

Putting values at the heart of a new UK foreign policy

Securing the national interest in an uncertain world has to be about helping set the long-term framework of the international systems in which the UK operates rather than simply a transactional approach that helps get the country through the short-term security and economic challenges to which political incentives are often aligned. Given the increasingly authoritarian and populist turn in countries across the world, the UK (and other like-minded nations) has two main choices: either to acquiesce to this trend as inevitable, or redouble its efforts, in concert with others, to stem the erosion and ensure a future for a reformed liberal democracy at the nation-state level and a more inclusive international system. As a medium-sized power, in spite of all the assets it has, Britain would struggle to turn the tide on its own, even if its short-term political incentives encouraged it to do so. The UK will need to strengthen its engagement with existing partners and institutions as well as look at new ways to work with those who share its values.

Particularly post-Brexit, showing the UK's commitment to multilateralism is an essential part of reassuring the international community that it is still a reliable partner. This would include taking the Council of Europe and OSCE more seriously as forums for engagement in the European and post-Soviet spaces, in addition to NATO, while working to reform all three. This willingness to work within as well as reform multilateral spaces will be even more crucial as the UK seeks to redefine its relationships with the Commonwealth and the Global South. To be taken seriously as a future partner, the UK must tread carefully and intentionally remedy the historic power imbalances institutionalised in the UN and Bretton Woods institutions. In the absence of deliberate action, 'Global Britain' could too easily be (mis)interpreted as 'Empire 2.0'.

If the UK (and its allies) is serious about reforming the international order while defending the need for one, it must clearly address the gap between governments and the governed that has been so exploited by populist forces. This means outing and standing against the systemic injustices and inequalities that are the root cause of poverty, and disenfranchisement globally and domestically. It requires a bold re-articulation of the current challenges centred on common causes rather than fuelling the zero-sum narrative of winners and losers (against groups such as immigrants). There has to be greater representation of young people, women, ethnic minorities and the economically marginalised, as set out by a number of authors in this collection, including Marissa Conway. This means opening up foreign policy to wider public scrutiny and acknowledging that win-win solutions are possible, but not easy and not immediate. The economic, social and technological dislocations that are happening are not unique to any one segment of the UK, nor to the UK itself, and there is a need for them to be managed with sensitivity and greater support given to communities undergoing change. Failure to do so will only further fuel an anti-liberal, anti-rights backlash. However, these dislocations should be addressed while, and in part by, tackling the inequalities inherent in the current international rules-based order and in some of the UK's existing policies.

The UK needs to be consistent in the application of its stated values to its enemies and allies alike, as well as to itself. Dominic Raab's announcement of the greater use of targeted sanctions against individuals involved in human rights abuses, using the 'Magnitsky' clause in the 2018 Sanctions and Anti-Money Laundering Act, is to be warmly welcomed.³¹ However it is notable that the countries being briefed as likely to be covered in the first roll-out include Russia, North Korea and Libya. The test of the government's commitment will be whether human rights abusers from countries with stronger ties to the UK, such as Saudi Arabia or Bahrain, face such sanctions.³² The UK should also ensure that the Arms Trade Treaty is applied equally to arms sales to friends and allies as well as enemies. The same applies to global economic rules. In addition to partaking fully in the OECD-BEPS discussions, including about a minimum effective corporate tax rate, the UK must continue to improve the standards of tax

³¹ UK Government – Legislation, *Sanctions and Anti-Money laundering Act 2018*, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2018/13/contents/enacted>

³² George Parker, *UK to begin crackdown on human rights abusers*, *Financial Times*, January 2020, <https://www.ft.com/content/38cd4b7e-32fd-11ea-a329-0bcf87a328f2>

transparency in its Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies.³³ The UK cannot claim to uphold the international order while allowing exceptions when it is convenient.

In international development a values-led approach is best manifested by maintaining the primacy of poverty reduction as the guiding principle behind aid decisions. The instrumentalisation of aid in service of security or trade objectives would undermine the effectiveness of British aid, which is a key element of Britain's soft power. Strengthening local ownership, investing in civil society and country capacity to tackle inequalities, and implementing a rights-based approach to development is the best way to deliver development objectives and to contribute to other global goods. The Sustainable Development Goals represent a new model of multilateral decision-making, rooted in the agency of affected populations rather than charity. They also offer Britain a source of untapped solutions to domestic policy challenges.

Returning to an imagined golden era of UK foreign policy is not an option. The flaws, inconsistencies and injustices contained within the existing world order have made challenges to it inevitable. The essays in this collection therefore both seek to re-establish the importance of longstanding global norms, rules and multilateral decision-making, whilst also exploring ways to do things differently: with new alliances based on common values; with approaches that explicitly seek to reflect the experiences of the most marginalised people; and with new approaches to emerging strategic problems. They give some ideas on how the UK can find a role in this changing world.

What our authors say

Baroness Anelay writes that we are living through a time of worldwide disruption and change. Against that backdrop, the United Kingdom left the European Union on 31st January 2020 and now has the opportunity to give substance to the mantra of 'Global Britain'. As the UK navigates our way forward, our strength will lie in maintaining our values grounded in human rights. The times may indeed be changing, but our values should remain constant.

Rt Hon Tobias Ellwood MP believes that the UK is emerging from a decisive election victory, with a cautious optimism returning to the nation. He writes that now the Government is turning its attention to developing and promoting 'Global Britain', we must ask ourselves what role we are going to play in response to the complex security threats this new decade brings. He believes we face a pivotal moment where, if we choose, the UK can provide the thought leadership, soft power and occasional hard power that can inspire other nations to work with us on reviving the Western project against rising authoritarianism. To do so now will require investment in different strategic areas, but the long-term security and economic benefits of this investment mean he believes that this is a price the nation would deem worth paying.

Rt Hon Lord McConnell argues that the multilateral rules-based system has never been more important, but it is undermined from all sides. He writes that the UK must work with others to support it, but that we can also help lead a longer-term debate and mobilisation for reform. He believes it is time for new diplomatic alliances to build 21st century multilateral institutions, promote basic values and create a safer, fairer and cleaner world.

Ruth Bergan and Dr Emily Jones write that post-Brexit, the UK has an extremely ambitious trade agenda: it will begin negotiating its own trade deals for the first time in more than 45 years and take up independent membership of the World Trade Organization (WTO). In this essay, the authors argue that the UK has a unique opportunity to do things differently. It can choose to align trade policy with wider societal goals by making inclusion, equity and sustainability the hallmarks of UK trade policy. It can showcase transparent and inclusive decision-making by introducing gold-standard processes for public and parliamentary engagement in trade policymaking. As it also embarks on hosting COP26, it has a huge opportunity to pioneer new ways of aligning trade and environmental policies, helping to drive work at the WTO and assessing its own trade policy against climate and environmental goals. Finally, it

³³ Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Base Erosion and Profit Shifting.

can make sure bilateral and multilateral agreements are aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals and supportive of developing country regional integration plans.

Dr Teresa Dumasy, Jonathan Cohen and Richard Reeve write that investments by states in improving global security are failing; in 2020 the world feels a fragile and insecure place. In the UK alone, there are huge differences in the way people experience insecurity. These realities raise important questions for the UK Government about the nature and understanding of security and of the UK's contribution to it. Ambiguity in the perception of 'national interest,' and tension between the UK's presumed national and transnational interests and those of individual humans and humanity at large call for a reframing of security. The essay puts forward 'shared security' as an underpinning value for our future security, defence and foreign policy, and people-focused peacebuilding as a central pillar of shared security practice.

Caroline Lucas MP argues that, looking ahead to the crucial climate summit which the UK will co-host in Glasgow in November, the opportunity is there for the UK to show true climate leadership, but it will have to significantly step up its diplomatic effort to achieve what is needed at COP26. She argues that this will have to be accompanied by honesty and integrity in domestic climate policy, 'getting our own house in order', recognising the obligation to move further and faster than other countries, supporting them financially to adapt and cover losses, and transferring the technology needed to give everyone a just future in the face of this climate emergency.

Theo Clarke MP explores the mutually reinforcing contributions UK aid has made to global development and security, highlighting the central role the Department for International Development (DFID) has played in making Britain a global leader and authority on development. UK aid helps to create a safer, healthier, more prosperous world, and this benefits Britain. Development aid, alongside diplomacy, defence and trade, must continue to play a key role in Britain's post-Brexit foreign policy.

Stephen Twigg argues that the UK has an opportunity to show leadership to tackle Global Goal 10 on inequality. He suggests a number of measures that DFID could take to strengthen its work in this area, including legislative change and a focus on inequality in the next Spending Review and Voluntary National Review. As well as addressing income inequality, he also sets out the case for a renewed commitment to tackling inequality based on gender and disability.

Marissa Conway argues that fresh on the heels of Brexit, the landscape of British foreign policy is infused with uncertainty. She poses the question of how we will craft our legacy now that we are outside the structures of the EU. The UK has the opportunity to be a leader in building peace through its foreign policy, not by means of claiming power over others, but by adopting a strong ethical framework to guide its decision-making in order to set a new international standard for placing human rights at the centre of policy. And she writes that there is no better way to do so than by adopting a Feminist Foreign Policy.

Sophie Howe explores how Wales, through the Well-being of Future Generations Act 2015, is putting values and the needs of future generations at the top of the agenda in an uncertain world. She urges the rest of Britain to follow in their footsteps. The current system is failing and needs to change. Acknowledging the continued power of vested interests, the risks of political inertia and the hard work required, she argues for brave political leadership that creates the conditions and political infrastructure for progressive change, so future leaders and their societies can tackle the challenges they face based on values of cooperation, responsibility sharing and inclusion.



WHEN TIMES CHANGE SHOULD WE CHANGE WITH THEM?

Baroness Anelay of St Johns¹

Royal Assent to the European Withdrawal Act was announced in the House of Lords on Thursday, 23rd January 2020.² That was the legal launch pad for our exit from the European Union. I am ever the optimist, so I believe that the United Kingdom can look forward to a new decade and a successful post-Brexit future.

We must be ambitious but smart when we consider how to conduct ourselves on the global stage. We should seek partnerships, not dominion. We have an opportunity now to give substance to the mantra of 'Global Britain'. We must seize that opportunity, not waste it.

Both Government and Parliament will face new challenges. As Lord Callanan, the DExEU Minister, said 'Following our exit' [we] 'will see more legislation on a range of topics connected with our departure from the European Union, and in some cases it will be the first time in decades that the UK has legislated on some of these matters'.³

¹ Baroness Anelay of St Johns is a Conservative member of the House of Lords, where she chairs the International Relations and Defence Select Committee. She is also a member of the House of Lords Conduct Select Committee. During the years 2010–2017, she served as Government Chief Whip in the House of Lords from 2010–14 and then served as Minister of State at FCO, DFID and DExEU. She was also the Prime Minister's Special Representative for the Prevention of Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative 2015–17.

² Once a bill has completed all the parliamentary stages in both Houses, it is ready to receive royal assent. This is when the Queen formally agrees to make the bill into an Act of Parliament (law); *Hansard*, House of Lords, 23rd January 2020 Vol. 801 col. 1252.

³ Department for Exiting the European Union; *Hansard*, House of Lords, 22nd January 2020 Vol. 801 col. 1136.

As we navigate the way ahead on a path that serves UK interests well, we should continue to be an outward-looking country that is a champion of collective security, the rule of law, human rights, free trade, anti-corruption work and a rules-based international system. Those are the values that have served us well and can continue to do so.

Times may indeed change, but our strength will lie in maintaining our values grounded in human rights. The UK should, therefore, proudly maintain its commitment to spending 0.7 per cent of gross national income on development and do more to help countries receiving development aid to become self-sufficient. The Department for International Development (DFID) is the major, but by no means the only, government department responsible for delivering that 0.7 per cent.

When I travelled overseas as a Minister at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO), I saw at first hand the positive impact of government development aid when we work with civil society in raising standards of living, security and gender equality in difficult environments such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), South Sudan, Myanmar and Iraq.

My interest in that work has not waned since I went to the backbenches a couple of years ago. For example, last year I took part in a BGIPU visit to Addis Ababa, capital of Ethiopia.⁴ We travelled out of the city to Ad'a District and saw the progress made possible in education and health by UK Aid at an elementary school and a health centre.⁵ The health centre has won several awards for its work in reducing child and maternal mortality and for its work on tackling HIV AIDS, TB and malaria.

While in Ethiopia I also visited the Retrak Rehabilitation Centre for former street children in Lideta District, Addis Ababa. The Centre is supported by the Home Office Modern Slavery Innovation Fund. Retrak is part of the Hope for Justice charity, which works to bring an end to modern slavery by preventing exploitation, rescuing victims, restoring lives and reforming society.⁶ It was an example of a government department outside DFID delivering a successful programme in partnership with a charity that has an impressive track record.

The DFID Water, Sanitation and Health (WASH) programme aims to support poor people to access better water and sanitation, and to introduce improved hygiene practices to support the UK Government's target of reaching 60 million people with improved water, sanitation and hygiene. The WASH programme in Ethiopia is delivered by the SWIFT Consortium.⁷ The Consortium is led by Oxfam, with Tearfund and Overseas Development Institute as global members and Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) as global associate.⁸

Our partnership with civil society plays an important role in our objective to see Ethiopia transform into a stable, industrialised, resilient and more inclusive country, which is able to self-finance its way out of poverty and harness the potential of its young people.⁹

I believe that international and national non-governmental organisations have an essential role to play in the effective delivery of UK development aid. As we move forward post-Brexit, we should celebrate and expand the role of civil society in delivering our partnerships in prosperity, peace and development overseas.

The media have widely reported calls for the Government to merge DFID with the FCO to achieve better coordination of the spending of the UK's development aid budget. I have been a Minister at both

⁴ British Group Inter-Parliamentary Union.

⁵ UK Aid is the 'brand' of The Department for International Development. DFID is a UK government department responsible for administering overseas aid. The goal of the department is 'to promote sustainable development and eliminate world poverty'.

⁶ Hope for Justice is a charity working towards ending modern day slavery: www.hopeforjustice.org/

⁷ SWIFT Consortium aims to deliver sustainable access to safe water and sanitation and encourage the adoption of basic hygiene practices in the DRC and Kenya: www.swiftconsortium.org

⁸ Tearfund is a Christian relief and development charity: www.tearfund.org. Overseas Development Institute is an independent think tank: www.odi.org. Water and Sanitation for the Urban Poor (WSUP) is a not-for-profit company set up by seven organisations in 2005: www.wsup.com

⁹ 40 per cent of the population is under the age of 15.

departments and admire those who work within them and their achievements. I do not believe that such a merger would be sensible. It would damage the status of DFID and there would be a perception that the commitment to our 0.7 per cent pledge had been diminished. There is already capacity for coordination within the role of the National Security Council (NSC) where diplomacy, development and defence are welded together.

I would, however, press the Government to strengthen the role of the NSC by accepting the recommendation of the House of Lords International Relations Select Committee that the NSC's remit should be extended to include international economic issues. The Committee concluded that 'The establishment of the National Security Council has had a beneficial effect on the coordination of Britain's external policies. But in the modern world economic issues are inextricably linked to those of national security and international relations.'¹⁰

The IRC concluded that 'We are living through a time of worldwide disruption and change. Trends including populism, identity politics, nationalism, isolationism, protectionism and mass movements of people are putting considerable pressure on states and traditional structures of government. At the same time, the global balance of power is shifting and fragmenting in a way not experienced since the Second World War, undermining the rules-based international order.'¹¹

On that global stage we are only one player in a crowded field, but it does not mean that we have to walk alone.

- We can work with like-minded partners around the world. In doing so we should be an energetic champion of free and open trade, encouraging small and medium-sized businesses to flourish and create jobs for the next generation.
- As we move ahead, post-Brexit, forging new trade deals, the UK Government should make the defence of the rules-based international order a central theme of all its bilateral relationships. For example, we should ensure that we actively engage with partners who share our promotion of the Ruggie Principles in the business world.¹²
- We can step up our work with multilateral organisations such as the United Nations, the Commonwealth, NATO, the Bretton Woods institutions¹³ and the World Trade Organization. As the International Relations Select Committee in the House of Lords recommended, we should continue to resist the challenges of our closest ally, the United States, to the multilateral system.¹⁴
- We can play to our strengths and be in the Premier League of those who can be trusted to deliver on commitments to trade, security, innovation and prosperity. The big diplomatic opportunity to demonstrate those strengths in 2020 will be the United Nations Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26).¹⁵ It will be co-hosted by the UK and Italy and will take place in Glasgow in November. The UN Secretary General said he was 'disappointed' with the results of COP25 and that: 'The international community lost an important opportunity to show increased ambition on mitigation, adaptation and finance to tackle the climate crisis.' We can and must make every effort to ensure that COP26 does not meet the same fate. Our reputation depends upon it.

Times may change, but our values should remain constant.

¹⁰ House of Lords Select Committee on International Relations, *UK foreign policy in a shifting world order: 5th Report of Session 2017–19*, HL Paper 250, paragraph 312, page 80, 2019, <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldintrel/250/250.pdf>

¹¹ Ibid, summary, page 3.

¹² The three pillars of the Ruggie Principles are: protect, **respect** and remedy. The Ruggie Principles consist of 31 directives, framed in three main pillars: the state duty to protect against **human rights** abuses, the corporate **responsibility to respect human rights** and the need to help victims achieve remedy.

¹³ The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

¹⁴ House of Lords Select Committee on International Relations, *UK foreign policy in a shifting world order*, summary, page 3, 2019.

¹⁵ COP is the formal meeting to assess progress in dealing with climate change and establish legally binding obligations for developed countries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.



THE STRATEGIC CHALLENGES FACING THE UK

Tobias Ellwood MP¹

The United Kingdom emerges from a decisive election victory with a Prime Minister enjoying the rarest of political phenomena: a Brexit-fatigued nation – wanting clarity about where Britain now goes – and a fresh, energised Government armed with a significant Parliamentary majority, providing the time and space to potentially define a decade of centre-right politics.

Whilst a feeling of cautious optimism may have returned to the UK, security-wise the next decade will be no walk in the park. We raise our head up after three years of Brexit distraction to find a world getting more wickedly dangerous than at any time since the Cold War. Only two months into the New Year, we have had worrying demonstrations of the so-called great power competition that on current trajectory will characterise the next ten years: near-conflict with Iran, terrorist attacks in London, international discord over Libya's future, climate change consequences in Australia, the Five Eyes row over Huawei, China's secrecy over the coronavirus, and Putin's attempt to illegitimately extend his presidency.

¹ Tobias Ellwood was elected as Member of Parliament for Bournemouth East in May 2005, and subsequently re-elected in 2010, 2015, 2017 and most recently in December 2019. He was Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the FCO with special responsibility for the Middle East and Africa from July 2014, and served as Parliamentary Under Secretary of State in the Ministry of Defence from 2017–2019. He is currently the Chair of the House of Commons Defence Select Committee. Tobias was Parliamentary Advisor to the Prime Minister for the 2014 NATO Summit and a member of the Parliamentary Delegation to the NATO Assembly 2014. Before becoming a MP, he spent six years in the Regular Army with The Royal Green Jackets, headquartered in Winchester, and served in Northern Ireland, Cyprus, Kuwait, Germany, Gibraltar and Bosnia. On leaving the army, Tobias worked as a researcher for the former Defence Secretary, the Rt Hon Tom King MP (now Lord King) in Westminster, and also in his constituency of Bridgwater. Since being elected as an MP, Tobias has pioneered the concept of 'social action' within the Party and the first ever Conservative social action project took place in Springbourne, Bournemouth. The concept of raising funds and rallying MPs and volunteers around an identified community project is now well established and Tobias regularly leads projects both in the UK and abroad, previously joining projects in countries including Bosnia and Bangladesh.

This progressive demise of our international security is often summed up as the erosion of our international rules-based order, blamed crudely on China, Russia and Iran writing their own rules, the continued threat of jihadi extremism, and the proliferating consequences to stability from climate change. In establishing what our own strategic security response is to these and other regional and thematic challenges, we must first ask the fundamental yet awkward question as to how international standards that have served us relatively well since the end of the Second World War are increasingly becoming obsolete.

This was the focus at the recent Munich Security Conference, which debated the 'decay of the Western project' – a loss of common understanding as to what it means to be part of the West and the need to redefine our purpose and resolve in defending what we stand for.² Far from being a geographic collection of states, this has developed into a collective commitment to liberal democracy and human rights, and to a transparent, accountable, market-based liberal economy with a wider commitment to collective responsibility. Since WWII and the advancement of an international economy, there has been a hopeful but often naïve assumption that Western values would take root and mature across the globe, with Russia, China and Middle Eastern states developing into responsible stakeholders in a Western-led liberal world order.

Today the opposite is happening. The Western world has not only reached its limits in shaping events; it is under attack and on the retreat. Not only is the world becoming less Western – the West is too.

From the strategic issues – such as what next for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) addressing the Iran nuclear issue, Russian sanctions, honouring the Paris Climate change accord, and the potential dangers of Chinese tech companies such as Huawei – to the more tactical problems such as protection of international shipping in the Straits of Hormuz or allowing the UK continued participation in the Galileo GPS project, there are deep divisions as to how the West should or could speak with one voice.

Several factors are at play here.

Firstly, global institutions, once the core pillar of international order, have been neutered. United Nations Security Council resolutions are constantly vetoed by China and Russia, and the United States is blocking confirmation of the World Trade Organization's appointments, hampering its ability to arbitrate in trade disputes. NATO is failing to deal with a member state procuring air defence systems from Russia, and the European Union is coming to terms with losing a key member.³ In addition, there is disagreement between Germany and France over where this consensus-driven institution goes next. The abject failure to modernise these critical but dated international organisations has left the West without any club rules. And this has fuelled the rise in populist and isolationist national policies, illustrated most strikingly by the US.

Secondly, poorly administered military interventions such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan continue to haunt Western contributors to this day. The cost in allied lives and resources has been staggering and both countries are far from stable. Western parliaments are understandably hesitant to repeat the same mistakes. Consequently, the pendulum has swung the other way – against any major military intervention. But the obvious reluctance of the West to step forward does not make conflicts or disharmony disappear. It does, however, leave a vacuum for other states to step forward and pursue very different agendas, as seen with Russia in Syria.

Thirdly, there is the changing character of war. Advancement in the digital world continues to complicate the battlefield as our increasing reliance on technologies in how we live, work, travel and communicate makes our economy ever more vulnerable to cyber interference. Another illustration of how our international institutions have failed to keep up with a fast-moving world is that there are no

² Elif İlhamoğlu, *As the 56 Munich Security Conference ends, the Western alliance is at the brink of collapse*, United World, February 2020, <https://uwidata.com/8093-as-the-56-munich-security-conference-ends-the-western-alliance-is-at-the-brink-of-collapse/>

³ Amie Ferris-Rotman and Kareem Fahim, *Russia readies S-400 missiles for Turkey amid warnings of US sanctions on NATO ally*, *The Washington Post*, July 2019, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/russia-confirms-plans-to-send-s-400-anti-aircraft-system-to-nato-member-turkey/2019/07/05/1f89ec0a-9f1c-11e9-83e3-45fded8e8d2e_story.html

rules or Geneva Conventions on how we fairly administer the cyber world across borders. The same applies to space, where there are even fewer rules. Space is now seen as the ultimate high ground and its weaponisation continues.

Given the demise of the Western project, it is easier to appreciate the latitude that has been granted to the 'non-West' to pursue its own agenda. Both Russia, China and to some extent Iran have upgraded their own military might and are now too big to punish. As illustrated by China's advancement in the South China Sea, Russia's incursion into Crimea and eastern Ukraine and Iran's proxy involvement across the Middle East, the West has become too risk-averse. Fear of escalation prohibits both sides from wanting direct action. President Trump's climbdown after the Iranian retaliation to the Soleimani drone strike is a case in point. We have moved from the Cold War scenario, where the threat of retaliation for errant behaviour was very real, to attempting to deny our competitors the ability to occupy the space (digitally or physically) in the first place. Thus, we place NATO troops in Latvia and Estonia to stop Russia and ban or limit Huawei in building our 5G infrastructure networks.

Whilst the West now punches below its weight, Russia is certainly punching above and is our most immediate and blunt challenge. However, growing discontent with its failing economy means there could be internal challenges for Russia ahead.⁴

The major strategic challenges worth expanding upon are climate change and the rise of China.

Efforts to cap the global temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels have failed. With no prospect of this being reversed we will soon reach the point of no return, where the damage done to our sensitive ecosystem will lead to rising sea levels, extreme weather changes, failed crop production, mass migration and increased conflict over sparser resources – bringing untold misery to millions around the globe.

China's phenomenal growth over the last decade has allowed the Communist party to quietly invest vast sums of money into its military, technology and economy. It has the largest army in the world, its navy grows by the size of the UK's every year and its air force is now developing fifth generation fast jets.⁵ The display of armaments wheeled across Tiananmen Square for the 70th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China was jaw-dropping. Its Belt and Road initiative has lured dozens of countries, mainly in Asia and Africa, into long-term debt, having signed up for infrastructure projects they cannot afford.⁶

The current coronavirus problems aside, China is on course to overtake the US both economically and militarily.⁷ And if that is not worrying enough, both Iran and Russia could soon be fully under its economic and technological spell.

Returning to where we started, the Prime Minister's inbox is increasingly dominated by the now familiar list of non-Western complex threats and what the West should do about them. In promoting 'Global Britain', he is aware our international voice will sound hollow without firstly advancing our own defence posture. Given our historical reputation as a nation which steps forward, when others hesitate, to defend our standards and way of life, we must ask ourselves what role we aspire to play as we contemplate the state of the West, the fundamental shifts in power bases and the advancement of technologies all altering the character of conflict.

⁴ Max Seddon, *Vladimir Putin admits to Russian's anger over faltering economy*, *Financial Times*, June 2019, <https://www.ft.com/content/32ce653c-9361-11e9-aea1-2b1d33ac3271>

⁵ Lindsay Maizland, *China's Modernizing Military*, Council on Foreign Relations, February 2020, <https://www.cfr.org/background/chinas-modernizing-military>

⁶ Public Policy, *China's Belt and Road Initiative: Why the Price Is Too High*, Knowledge@Wharton, April 2019, <https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/chinas-belt-and-road-initiative-why-the-price-is-too-high/>

⁷ Evan Osnos, *The Future of America's Contest with China*, *The New Yorker*, January 2020, <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/01/13/the-future-of-americas-contest-with-china>

The Government's review into defence, security and foreign policy has much to consider. Three fundamental questions must be answered, beginning by asking honestly what our current hard power capabilities are. We arguably retain the most professional armed forces in the world. But for some years, successive Governments have perpetuated the perception that we are able to defend our interests well beyond our shores. The reality is a little different. For example, we boast impressive new aircraft carriers, but without a sizeable budget increase the rest of the surface fleet has been impacted. Likewise, the introduction of the Typhoon and F35 jets shows we have impressive and world-beating kit, but our fast jet capability has shrunk from 36 during the Gulf War to six today.⁸ Both our main battle tank and Warrior armoured personnel carrier are over 20 years old and, like so much of our kit, are pending upgrades. The new dimensions of warfare such as cyber and space security demand urgent and significant investment.

Secondly, what repair, upgrade and advancements should be made to our international institutions that would invigorate confidence in a modern, relevant and enforceable rules-based order? Failure to modernise will see the world gradually fragment into a loose conglomeration of Western nations challenged by the 'non-West' – led by China, promoting a far more authoritarian outlook.

Thirdly, a sober assessment of the short-, medium- and long-term threats that we are likely to face is needed. The first line of the Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR) 2015 reminds us that our economic security – our prosperity – is ever dependent upon our national security.⁹ As the world moves faster and becomes more dangerous, there is a tragic collective naivety about the durability of peace. Our country, our economy and our values are vulnerable to these growing dangers that have no respect for borders.

Finally, we must determine what leadership role Britain aspires to play. The recent absence of any senior UK Government or military figures at the world's largest security conference in Munich is not a good omen.¹⁰ If we choose, Britain can provide the thought leadership, soft power and occasional hard power that can inspire other nations to work with us. It can help to revive what it means to be part of the 'Western Project', as the Munich Conference termed it.

We face a pivotal moment. What sort of nation do we want to be? Do we aspire to influence the world as a force for good, or are we happy to withdraw to a more reactive footing, with all the negative consequences that may entail – not only for our security but our economy too? I choose the former. It has always been in our nation's DNA to step forward when other nations might hesitate. To do so now will require investment, but the long-term security and economic benefits mean this is a price the nation would deem worth paying.

⁸ Tobias Ellwood MP, *The UK must prepare for a dangerous decade and seek a more influential role*, *The House Magazine*, Politics Home, January 2020, <https://www.politicshome.com/news/uk/defence/house/house-magazine/109309/tobias-ellwood-mp-uk-must-prepare-dangerous-decade-and>

⁹ HM Government, *National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015: A Secure and Prosperous United Kingdom*, November 2015, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/555607/2015_Strategic_Defence_and_Security_Review.pdf

¹⁰ Helen Warrell, Guy Chazan and Michael Peel, 'Global Britain' goes missing at Munich security summit, *Financial Times*, February 2020, <https://www.ft.com/content/852e15bc-50de-11ea-90ad-25e377c0ee1f>



NEW ALLIANCES FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Rt Hon Lord McConnell¹

January 31st 2020. Brexit Day. A moment in our history, a change in our global position, a significant step away from the strategic direction of our foreign policy for over 50 years. ‘Global Britain’ might be the ambition, but there is as yet no defining vision that might provide some clarity, direction and hope. That void is a threat to the global standing and influence of the United Kingdom, and possibly a threat to our security and prosperity too. But it could also be an opportunity – a chance to look beyond the second half of the 20th century deep into the 21st.

In the aftermath of 1945, the UK was a leader, playing an important part in establishing the United Nations, helping to set up and grow global financial institutions and transforming a former empire into a Commonwealth of Nations. But, as the Cold War divided global relationships into East and West and we followed the founding members into the European Economic Community, our strategy seemed increasingly to be following others rather than leading.

After the people of Berlin tore down the wall that most symbolised the divided world, the UK’s place in the world became defined by deepening integration within the European Union and trying to bridge European allies and the United States. There were energetic and meaningful global initiatives – from Tony Blair’s leadership of the Gleneagles G8 Summit and Gordon Brown’s calling together of the G20, to William Hague’s drive against sexual violence in conflict and David Cameron’s contribution to the

¹ The Rt Hon Lord McConnell was First Minister of Scotland from 2001–2007 and UK Special Representative for Peacebuilding from 2008–2010. Jack is Co-Chair of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on the UN Global Goals, Vice President of UNICEF UK, Deputy Chair of the UK/Japan 21st Century Group and Chancellor of the University of Stirling. He chairs the judging panel of the Tomorrow’s Peacebuilders International Awards and advises on the Bangsamoro Peace Agreement in the Philippines.

Global Goals – but essentially, we embraced existing multilateral clubs and have been one of their most loyal and collegiate members.²

Our multilateralism at times amplified our diplomatic impact on current events, but as we strived to make the status quo work better this restricted our wider engagement in debate around a vision for the new century. The fact that so many still use the term ‘the West’ to describe our ‘side’ indicates how little progress we have made in shaping a new world order since 1989.

Yet our values and our influence are needed more than ever, with 70 million or so displaced people in the world, the climate and biodiversity emergency, parts of the world stuck in extreme poverty and in many cases violent conflict.³ In many developing and developed countries, attacks on freedom of speech and entrenched discrimination reinforce inequality, fear and violence. We face new threats – cyber, space, acts of terror – and the escalation of old threats like nuclear weapons and the annexation of neighbouring lands. Meanwhile the international infrastructure is from another age. The strongest ignore the global rules, and the weakest have no rules at home.

The multilateral balance is changing: the US is increasingly looking to its own interests rather than the global interest, Russia is increasingly powerful again beyond its borders, and China is not just an economic superpower, but a diplomatic and development superpower as well. Continental and regional blocs like the African Union and the Association of South East Asian Nations have increased their impact, not just economically but in security, diplomacy and development too.

So, the big choice for both the left and right in the UK, for this government and those who want to be the next, is do we step back, secure our current level of influence, preserve the past and defend our way of life and prosperity here in the UK? Or are we ready to be bold and shape the future? Are we ready to lead the debate, define success in the long term, shape a new 21st century infrastructure and promote our values around the world? In short, can we make a sustained effort beyond immediate political cycles to shape a new international diplomatic and political landscape to meet the challenges of the 21st century?

I believe now is the time to seize the opportunity to build fresh alliances: alliances with a vision for change in the multilateral framework; alliances that stand consistently and firmly behind key principles on human rights and the rule of law; alliances that secure peace and safety in the face of new threats; alliances for fair and free trade; alliances that can shape the international debate for the 21st century the way the UK helped shape the debate for the 20th.

The time has surely come when we can move on from those institutions that grew out of past crises and be the political and diplomatic powerhouse behind new alliances for the next decades of the 21st century.

The UN Security Council is stuck, passing resolutions but too often frozen by vetoes and suspicion. The World Trade Organization and others need reform. There is little recognition in any of the multilaterals of the potential in the continental and regional organisations if more power and resources were decentralised out of New York and the other centres of post-WWII diplomacy.

We need to be brave and lead the debate for global multilateral institutional reform. We still have a system based on the outcome of WWII and the Cold War years, a system designed for that period rather than for the 21st century. The UK is uniquely placed to be a bridge between old and new power: to lead a decade-long debate and deliberation on the role and structure of the UN; the role, aims and

² University of Toronto, *Official Documents: Gleneagles Summit*, July 2005, <http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/index.html>; *The Economic Times*, *Brown calls for a pact on financial regulations at G-20 summit*, March 2009, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/brown-calls-for-a-pact-on-financial-regulations-at-g-20-summit/articleshow/4227500.cms?from=mdr>; FCO and The Rt Hon William Hague, *Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict*, November 2013, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/preventing-sexual-violence-in-conflict>; Prime Minister's Office, *PM's speech to the UN Sustainable Development Goals Summit 2015*, September 2015, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-to-the-un-sustainable-development-goals-summit-2015>

³ Adrian Edwards, *Global forced displacement tops 70 million*, UNHCR UK, June 2019, <https://www.unhcr.org/uk/news/stories/2019/6/5d08b6614/global-forced-displacement-tops-70-million.html>

objectives of the multilateral organisations; and the way in which new powers are brought to the top table, play a role and accept responsibility as well as rights. To do so, we must stop focussing only on the next speech, headline or summit communiqué.

Agreement on reform of the UN and other bodies is not easy, but it is not impossible either. The UK should partner with a group of allies who favour change and set a long-term objective of building consensus for reform over a decade, not a year. It is 75 years since the UN first met in London – this could be an opportunity to seriously consider a new Security Council structure and the decentralisation of the UN programme delivery to the regional and continental level. It could be a chance to progress faster and to more equitable decision making on trade, and more effective international justice. With political will and determination, we may even be able to resolve and implement these in this first half of the 21st century. We at least need to try.

Alongside a grouping of those committed to reform, the 21st century demands new diplomatic alliances based on values rather than the balancing of powers. We already have coalitions of the willing trying to resolve difficult conflicts or fragile situations and groups like the Friends of the Peacebuilding Fund at the UN.⁴ Others base their cooperation on geography or issues. But we need to take this one step further. Global concerns need a global response.

We need a new global movement that demands more: defending the democratic values we hold dear; standing for the independent rule of law – at home and internationally, asserting that in both, all citizens are equal before the law, challenging the widespread discrimination against women, LGBT people and persecuted religious and ethnic minorities still embedded in legal systems across every continent; tackling the climate emergency; supporting conflict prevention and post-conflict peacebuilding, including the need to engage women at all stages; reforming the UN and WTO; managing migration with humanity; developing and empowering those living in extreme poverty rather than exploiting their resources; and insisting that companies headquartered in our national legal systems must play by the rules, pay their taxes and trade fairly.

The UK should help build an alliance, or perhaps alliances, of countries committed to these ambitions. Japan would seem to be an obvious ally. New Zealand and Canada might be keen. But to be truly effective such groupings have to be inclusive – engaging stable democracies on every continent who support multilateral action and human rights. All should come together with a firm commitment to these shared values and aims, to embed them at the centre of bilateral relationships, and to promote them assertively in multilateral gatherings. This would be a real powerhouse for change to deliver a cleaner, safer and fairer world.

Of course, the old alliances still matter. Right now, we need a deep and meaningful partnership with the EU, and NATO remains essential to preserving collective security. The Commonwealth is a valuable forum; our business, cultural and professional networks extend our reach to every corner of the globe; and our top table seats at the G7, the G20, the World Bank and the UN mean the UK can continue to be a diplomatic superpower. We should use that position to lead the change, not defend the status quo.

As we move forward, UK influence and impact will depend more on what we contribute to the future than on what we have done in the past. Immediate action to demonstrate commitment to this longer-term vision will be possible this year.

We were one of the architects of the UN Global Goals.⁵ This year we are five years into a 15-year programme, yet progress is limited everywhere. We need to lead the way this year in upping our game and ensuring that the decade of action that is launched this year for the period up to 2030 actually delivers.

⁴ The UN Peacebuilding Fund is a UN financial instrument intended to help sustain peace in situations of fragility and violent conflict. See <https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund>

⁵ The Global Goals for Sustainable Development, *The 17 Goals*, <https://www.globalgoals.org/>

On climate, we need to use every tool at our disposal and ensure that we convene a successful COP26 in Glasgow in November, leading the world to come together and make meaningful decisions to tackle the climate and biodiversity emergency.

And, if we put human rights and fair trade up front in our diplomatic and trade discussions – and apply our values consistently – we can demonstrate we mean what we say. For this moment in history, nothing less will do.



MAKING UK TRADE POLICY WORK FOR ALL UK CITIZENS, DEVELOPMENT AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Ruth Bergan¹ and Dr Emily Jones²

Introduction: The opportunity to reset the UK trade agenda

The UK government has set itself a more ambitious trade agenda than any other country in recent history. As a result of Brexit, it needs to determine its own trade policy and negotiate trade deals with other countries for the first time in more than 45 years. In the coming months the UK will revise its general tariff schedules, undertake significant preparations so that it can become a fully independent member of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and embark on trade negotiations with the European Union and United States, its largest trading partners, as well as Australia, New Zealand and Japan.³

There is a lot at stake. Trade is the lifeblood of the UK economy and it matters for everyday life. Trade allows us to be one of the biggest nations of tea drinkers and to export Minis around the world. The

¹ Ruth Bergan is a Senior Advisor at the Trade Justice Movement, the UK national network engaged in policy and advocacy work towards socially and environmentally sustainable global trade. Ruth has led the organisation for the past ten years, providing policy expertise on a breadth of trade policy issues, including the EU's Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations with developing countries, the UK's investment protection provisions, and new work on the interactions between trade and climate change

² Dr Emily Jones is an Associate Professor at the Blavatnik School of Government, University of Oxford and a Fellow of University College. Emily directs the [Global Economic Governance Programme](#), which fosters research and debate on how to make the global economy inclusive and sustainable. She previously worked in Ghana's Ministry of Trade and Industry, for Oxfam GB and for the UK Department for International Development.

³ WTO, Member Information: United Kingdom and the WTO, https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/countries_e/united_kingdom_e.htm

rules and regulations we negotiate in trade agreements fundamentally affect our ability to maintain high environmental, labour, human rights and animal welfare standards, and to meet our international commitments on climate, the environment and sustainable development. The decisions that this government makes on trade will shape the UK economy and determine our ability to meet social and environmental goals for the foreseeable future and have an impact that stretches far beyond the government's five-year term.

The UK enters the trade world with an independent voice at a critical time in global trade policy. There is growing tension between the US and China, and friction between the US and the EU, including over the taxation of digital companies. The WTO, which should be the focal point for resolving such differences, is in deep crisis, not least because the US has retreated from multilateralism and a rules-based system in favour of ad hoc trade measures. Citizens in many industrialised countries are disillusioned with globalisation and deeply concerned about the impact of trade on jobs, economic inequality, public services and the environment.

The UK government has an opportunity to do things differently, ensuring that trade works for people in all parts of the UK, and is aligned with sustainable development, climate and environmental goals. In this essay we make four proposals on how the UK government can make that happen.

Proposal 1: Align trade policy with wider societal goals

People around the world are raising concerns that the trade system is not working for them. Part of the problem is that governments typically set very narrow economic objectives for their trade policy, looking to maximise trade flows and economic efficiency gains, and overlooking citizens' concerns about job losses and economic inequality. Trade, by its nature, creates winners and losers, strengthening some sectors and contributing to the decline of others. In many Western countries there have been gains at the national level from trade and automation, but there have also been significant disruption and job losses. These have been concentrated geographically and have contributed to rising regional inequalities.⁴ The UK has the highest regional inequalities of any industrialised country and the government has promised to ensure 'all parts of the UK benefit from any deal'.⁵ This will require a new regional approach to UK trade policy that is carefully designed to increase productivity and support tradable sectors in each region.⁶

UK citizens are also concerned about other implications of trade policy, including the impact on the quality and type of food we eat, the future of public services like the National Health Service (NHS), and the impact on biodiversity and carbon emissions.⁷ They also care about the links between trade and development. The UK is one of the largest markets in the world for fair trade products – 82 per cent of UK consumers are reported to care about Fairtrade – and the UK government has long been a champion of making trade work for development.⁸

⁴ Elena Rusticelli et al., *Going Local: A Regional Perspective on How Trade Affects Labour Markets and Inequality*. Economics Department Working Papers No. 1530, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, December 14 2018, [http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=ECO/WKP\(2018\)78&docLanguage=En](http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=ECO/WKP(2018)78&docLanguage=En)

⁵ UK2070 Commission, *Fairer and Stronger – Rebalancing the UK Economy*, May 2019, <http://uk2070.org.uk/2019/05/30/first-report-of-the-uk2070-commission-to-be-published-on-thursday-30th-may-2019/>; Robert Zymek and Ben Jones, *UK Regional Productivity Differences: An Evidence Review*, Industrial Strategy Council, February 2020, https://industrialstrategy.council.gov.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/UK%20Regional%20Productivity%20Differences%20-%20An%20Evidence%20Review_0.pdf; Elizabeth Truss, *Free Trade Agreements with the Rest of the World: Written Statement – HCWS96*, UK Parliament, February 6, 2020, <https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2020-02-06/HCWS96/>

⁶ OECD, *Productivity and Jobs in a Globalised World: (How) Can All Regions Benefit?*, Paris: OECD Publishing, April 2018, https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/employment/productivity-and-jobs-in-a-globalised-world_9789264293137-en;jsessionid=L0wE16C3yZnt4iJX-u-4hQ.ip-10-240-5-31

⁷ Sofia Vasilopoulou, Daniel Keith and Liisa Talving, *What the British public thinks about post-Brexit trade deals*, *The Conversation*, January 2020 <https://theconversation.com/what-the-british-public-thinks-about-post-brexit-trade-deals-128484>; Marley Morris, *Public attitudes to Brexit: the referendum was more a vote for re-regulation than for de-regulation*, LSE blog, April 2018, <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/the-referendum-was-more-a-vote-for-re-regulation-than-for-de-regulation/>

⁸ Katy O'Brien, *25 Facts About Fairtrade*, Fairtrade Foundation, October 2019, <https://www.fairtrade.org.uk/Media-Centre/Blog/2019/October/25-Facts-about-Fairtrade>

The UK has an historic opportunity to make inclusion, equity and sustainability the hallmarks of UK trade policy. Enshrining these over-arching objectives in legislation, together with a commitment to conducting sustainability impact assessments ahead of every UK trade negotiation and major trade policy decision, would help to ensure these objectives are pursued. In drafting such legislation, the UK government can draw inspiration from the WTO's founding document, where governments recognised that trade was a means to an end, not an end in itself.⁹

Proposal 2: Showcase transparent and inclusive decision-making

Citizens in the US, UK and many other countries have lost faith in globalisation. They believe the rules are rigged in favour of the powerful and have low trust in governments.¹⁰ Decisions over trade policy are often taken behind closed doors, and the texts of trade agreements can run to thousands of pages in a legal language that is difficult for non-specialists to engage with. The opacity of trade negotiations and lack of trust in their outcomes have contributed to the failure of major trade negotiations, including the US-EU trade deal (TTIP).¹¹

The UK government has committed to ensuring that trade policymaking is transparent and inclusive. It has promised that Parliament, the devolved administrations, the devolved legislatures, local government, business, trade unions, civil society and the public from every part of the UK will have the opportunity to engage with and contribute to trade policy.¹²

So far, UK decision-making is far from fulfilling these goals. As things stand, the UK Parliament has very little scrutiny over trade negotiations, and far fewer powers in this area than the US Congress or European Parliament.¹³

Concerns about weak parliamentary oversight have been raised by business, civil society, academics and five separate parliamentary committees.¹⁴ The government has promised to publish negotiating objectives and allow specific committees a scrutiny role, but this would still leave the UK lagging behind its main trading partners.¹⁵ There is an urgent need for the government to put in place a framework for democratic scrutiny and transparency that includes giving Parliament meaningful input into negotiating mandates, oversight of negotiating texts and a final confirmatory vote. In addition, there are many steps that the government can take to strengthen public, business and other stakeholder consultation, including through early publication of draft negotiating mandates which are thoroughly discussed with

⁹ WTO members agreed that they would conduct trade negotiations 'with a view to raising standards of living, ensuring full employment' and to 'allowing for the optimal use of the world's resources in accordance with the objective of sustainable development, seeking both to protect and preserve the environment'. See Uruguay Round Agreement, *Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization*, https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/04-wto_e.htm

¹⁰ Hannah Fingerhut, *Most Americans say US economic system is unfair, but high-income Republicans disagree*, Pew Research Center, February 2016, <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/02/10/most-americans-say-u-s-economic-system-is-unfair-but-high-income-republicans-disagree/>; Ipsos MORI, *Majority worldwide say their society is broken – an increasing feeling among Britons*, September 2019, <https://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/global-study-nativist-populist-broken-society-britain>;

¹¹ Katja Kipping, *What I Didn't Read In The TTIP Reading Room, War on Want*, February 2016, <https://www.waronwant.org/media/what-i-didn%E2%80%99t-read-ttip-reading-room>; Bernd Lange, *TTIP debate suffering from lack of transparency*, *The Parliament Magazine*, October 2014, <https://www.theparliamentmagazine.eu/articles/opinion/ttip-debate-suffering-lack-transparency>

¹² Department for International Trade and Prime Minister's Office, *Trade White Paper: our future UK trade policy*, October 2017, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/preparing-for-our-future-uk-trade-policy/preparing-for-our-future-uk-trade-policy>

¹³ Under current legislation (the 2016 Constitutional Reform and Governance Act (CRAGA)) the UK government is not required to consult Parliament over the choice of negotiating partner or the negotiating mandate, and Members of Parliament (MPs) have no right to see negotiating texts. Texts are only made public once they are concluded, at which point they are 'laid before' Parliament for a minimum of 21 sitting days. Parliament can ask to make time to consider the deal and vote on it, but this is challenging given that there are only 20 days per session when the opposition can set the Parliamentary agenda.

¹⁴ ICC UK, *A Trade Governance Model That Works for Everyone*, <https://iccwbo.uk/collections/free-resources/products/trade-governance-model>

¹⁵ Department for International Trade, *Process for making free trade agreements once the UK has left the EU*, February 2019, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/processes-for-making-free-trade-agreements-once-the-uk-has-left-the-eu>

stakeholders, greatly improving the advisory group structure, and reducing the use of non-disclosure agreements which hinder effective participation.¹⁶

There is broad consensus across UK stakeholders that the UK should be playing a leading role in developing robust mechanisms to make trade policymaking inclusive. In the words of John Denton, Secretary General of the International Chambers of Commerce, ‘efforts to drive the transition to a more inclusive world economy must begin with a trade governance model that is itself inclusive. We are here to demonstrate our capacity and eagerness to help governments chart a new course for global trade policy-making that places inclusion at its heart.’¹⁷ The UK could be the government that leads the way.

Proposal 3: Pioneer new ways of aligning trade and environmental policies

One of the biggest questions facing trade policymakers globally is how to align trade and environmental goals, and this is an area in which the UK could play a leading role. Since the late 1990s, the UK has been a world leader on climate change, through its domestic policies and its support for international climate negotiations. UK citizens are increasingly concerned about the environment, ranking it the fourth most important issue facing the UK when surveyed in late 2019.¹⁸ Yet, in the UK, as in other countries, there has been a disconnect between trade and environment policies.

There is now little dispute that trade rules can increase emissions, lock in fossil fuel infrastructure and make it harder to share green technology and build local green industries. For example, Quebec significantly reduced its renewable energy programme following a WTO challenge, and Germany lowered environmental standards in the Elbe River in response to an investment challenge.¹⁹

Several governments are starting to rethink. New Zealand is leading a five-country initiative to bring trade, climate change and sustainability together, advocating in particular for new trade restrictions on fossil fuel subsidies.²⁰ There have been negotiations to reduce tariffs on environmental goods, and the EU is proposing to introduce a carbon tax on imports. However, most trade policymakers are far from embracing the idea that trade needs to be aligned with environmental goals.

2020 provides a significant opportunity for the UK government to bring the trade and environmental policy worlds into conversation and to galvanise action. In June 2020 the UK will attend its first WTO ministerial meeting as an independent member, and in November 2020 the UK will host COP26, the most important international climate negotiations since Paris in 2015.

In the lead-up to the WTO ministerial conference, the UK should actively support the efforts of like-minded WTO Members to issue a Ministerial Statement on environmental sustainability and trade, and join the Friends of Fossil Fuel Subsidy Reform group. This should include reaching out to key trading partners in the Commonwealth and other developing countries to ensure the agenda is inclusive and earns their support.²¹ The UK should lead the way by taking clear domestic action on climate change and fossil fuel subsidy reform. It should review all trade provisions in its trade agreements to ‘stress test’ them against climate goals, in particular measures that impact on industrial strategy, investment

¹⁶ CBI, *Building A World-Leading UK Trade Policy*, <https://www.cbi.org.uk/media/3897/building-a-world-leading-uk-trade-policy-002.pdf>

¹⁷ ICC International, *The onus is on business to drive more inclusive trade*, May 2018, <https://iccwbo.org/media-wall/news-speeches/icc-secretary-general-denton-onus-business-drive-inclusive-trade/>

¹⁸ Sarah Prescott-Smith, *Which issues will decide the general election?*, YouGov, November 2019, <https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2019/11/07/which-issues-will-decide-general-election>

¹⁹ *WTO DS426: Canada – Measures Relating to the Feed-in Tariff Program; Vattenfall AB and others vs. Federal Republic of Germany*, ICSD, ARB/09/6

²⁰ New Zealand Foreign Affairs & Trade, *Agreement on Climate Change, Trade and Sustainability (ACCTS) negotiations*, <https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/trade/free-trade-agreements/climate/agreement-on-climate-change-trade-and-sustainability-accts-negotiations/>

²¹ Carolyn Deere Birkbeck, *Environment and Trade 2.0*, Hoffmann Centre for Sustainable Resource Economy, October 2019, <https://hoffmanncentre.chathamhouse.org/article/environment-and-trade-20/>

protection, intellectual property and regulatory cooperation chapters; promotion of climate-friendly technologies, goods, services and transport; and trade finance and capacity-building for countries suffering trade shocks and challenges related to climate change.

A further area in which the UK should align its environmental and trade policies relates to plastic pollution. The UK should step up and help lead the growing group of WTO Members keen to explore options for reducing trade in certain types of plastic, promoting trade in substitutes and harnessing trade policy to spur a more circular plastics economy.²²

At a national level, the UK can pioneer new ways to put sustainability at the heart of its trade agenda. The government has an ambitious 'Clean Growth Strategy' where it seeks to make the UK the global leader in a range of industries from electric cars to offshore wind, energy efficiency technologies, and low-carbon financial and professional services.²³ Making this vision a reality could be a central objective of UK trade policy. Agriculture is an important and politically sensitive part of all trade negotiations, and the UK could focus its agricultural commitments on promoting sustainable agriculture and biodiversity. Even more ambitiously, the UK could look to re-orient trade policy frameworks in favour of a more circular economy, and all elements of UK trade policy could be assessed against, for example, their contribution to phasing out fossil fuels, helping to reverse ecological damage and support for sustainable agriculture.

Proposal 4: Revitalising the trade and sustainable development agenda

Trade plays an important role in sustainable development. During the past two decades, the UK government has built up a reputation for championing sustainable development in international trade policy circles. In the face of substantial resistance, and with some success, the UK urged the EU and other advanced countries to open their markets to exports from developing countries. The EU's 'Everything but Arms' (EBA) scheme provides duty-free-quota-free access into the EU market for the least developed countries. The UK has been a major supporter of 'aid for trade', using development finance to address the competitiveness constraints and infrastructure gaps that make it hard for firms and farmers in developing countries to trade.

But it has not all gone smoothly. Negotiations between the EU (with the UK as a member) and most African and Pacific countries were acrimonious and are regularly referred to in policy circles as a 'well-intentioned diplomatic disaster'. They are still a major source of tension and the UN's Economic Commission for Africa argues that they will deliver uneven outcomes with limited gains for African countries and more generalised gains for the EU.²⁴

The UK now has the opportunity to revitalise its trade relations with developing countries, especially with African countries.²⁵ A first task is to minimise any trade disruption caused by Brexit. The government plans to replicate the EU's preference schemes for developing countries, a move that has been widely welcomed, and it is working to roll over existing trade agreements involving developing countries. The UK could be more ambitious, designing a scheme of preferences that addresses some of the complexities and shortcomings of the EU scheme. A frustration of many African countries is that EU trade agreements pose constraints on regional integration. The UK has an opportunity work with African governments to design a new continent-wide preference scheme that would increase exports of

²² Carolyn Deere Birkbeck, *Here's How the WTO Can Help Address Plastic Pollution*, World Economic Forum, January 2020, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/01/wto-address-plastic-pollution/>

²³ UK Government, *Clean Growth Strategy*, October 2017, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/clean-growth-strategy>

²⁴ UNECA and ATPC, *Economic Partnership Agreements and the African Continental Free Trade Area*, Policy Brief, UNECA, July 2016, https://www.uneca.org/sites/default/files/PublicationFiles/policy-brief_epas-and-cfta_final.pdf

²⁵ Dr Emily Jones and Conrad Copeland, *Making UK Trade Work for Development Post-Brexit: Workshop Report*, Global Economic Governance Programme, University of Oxford, June 2017, <https://www.geg.ox.ac.uk/sites/geg.bsg.ox.ac.uk/files/Making%20UK%20trade%20work%20for%20development%20post-brexit.pdf>

goods and services from African countries and support regional integration.²⁶ Where it looks to negotiate free trade agreements with developing countries, the UK could work to align each chapter with sustainable development objectives, including robust carve-outs for public services and strong and meaningful commitments on technology transfer.

As it revises its trade policies, it is important that the UK government considers knock-on effects for developing countries at every stage. Changes to the UK's general tariff regime and lowering of UK most-favoured-nation (MFN) tariffs could lead to substantial export losses in some developing countries as the value of their tariff preferences is eroded. For instance, reductions in MFN tariffs on garments and footwear would be damaging for Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Mauritius and Pakistan, while reductions on processed fish would harm exporting firms in Ecuador, Ghana, Mauritius, the Philippines and Vietnam.²⁷ The UK government can design its tariffs to maintain preferences where they are particularly valuable for developing countries. As the UK looks to diverge from EU trade regulations, businesses in developing countries will need to adapt to a myriad of new UK customs documents and product standards, which could be an expensive process. The UK government should work closely with exporters from developing countries, designing new UK customs rules and product standards with developing countries in mind, and supporting their firms to adapt to new UK requirements.

Next steps

At the time of writing it is unclear what the government's vision for trade is and how it will use trade policy to deliver for the UK economy or ensure it is responsive to wider concerns about economic inequalities and job losses, protecting the environment, and supporting sustainable development. These are pressing questions, not only in the UK, but internationally.

The UK government has indicated that it wants its trade agenda to work for all parts of the UK and align with its commitments under the Sustainable Development Goals and Multilateral Environmental Agreements. However, in practice, much government discourse around post-Brexit trade is focused on how the UK can best secure leverage with its trade partners to maximise regulatory autonomy and shore up narrow commercial interests.

The UK government has an historic opportunity to show that trade policy can be made to work for all citizens and for the environment. Now is the time for a step change in the UK government approach, towards one that places inclusion, equity, sustainable development, the climate and environmental stewardship at the heart of its trade policy.

²⁶ Maximiliano Mendez-Parra, *Designing a new UK preferences regime post-Brexit: How Africa can benefit*, ODI, September 2017, <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11757.pdf>

²⁷ Dirk Willem te Velde and Maximiliano Mendez-Parra, *Brexit and global development*, ODI, April 2019, <https://www.odi.org/blogs/10741-brexit-and-global-development>



SHARED SECURITY: HUMANS AND HUMANITY IN NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

Jonathan Cohen,¹ Dr Teresa Dumasy² and Richard Reeve³

Investments by states in improving global security are failing; in 2020 the world feels a fragile and insecure place. In the United Kingdom alone, there are huge differences in the way people experience insecurity. These realities raise important questions for the UK Government about the nature and understanding of security and of the UK's contribution to it. They also pose choices for the UK as it recalibrates its foreign, defence and security policies following its departure from the European Union.

¹ Jonathan Cohen has been the Executive Director of Conciliation Resources since May 2016. He joined the organisation in 1997 where he developed the Caucasus programme and in 2008 became Director of Programmes overseeing peacebuilding and mediation support initiatives across eight conflict-affected contexts. Previously Jonathan served as Deputy Director of the Foundation on Inter-Ethnic Relations in The Hague, working with the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. In 2007 he was awarded an OBE by the British Government for services to conflict prevention and conflict resolution in the Caucasus. In 2018 Jonathan became Chair of the European Peacebuilding Liaison Office and an Associate of the Imperial War Museum's Institute for the Public Understanding of War and Conflict.

² Dr Teresa Dumasy joined Conciliation Resources in 2010. As Director of Policy and Learning she directs work on international policy engagement, oversees the work of the gender and monitoring and evaluation teams, and leads cross-organisational learning and strategic planning. Teresa is Chair of the Bond Working Group on Counter-Terrorism and Sanctions and plays a leading role in efforts to reduce the impact of counter-terrorism legislation and sanctions on humanitarian and peacebuilding work. From 1998 to 2010 Teresa worked at the FCO and DFID. She is a Senior Research Fellow at the Conflict Analysis and Research Centre at the University of Kent.

³ Richard Reeve has been the Coordinator of Rethinking Security since October 2019. Between 2014 and 2019 he was Chief Executive of Oxford Research Group, directing its work on UK international security policy and developing its peacebuilding work in the Middle East. Previously he was Head of Research at International Alert, Europe's largest peacebuilding NGO. As a conflict researcher, he has also been a fellow of Chatham House's Africa Programme and King's College London's War Studies department, an editor and analyst with Jane's Information Group and other risk consultancies, and worked with the African Union, ECOWAS and Arab League.

‘National’ interests

This year, as every fifth year since 2010, the UK Government has committed to producing a revision of its National Security Strategy, the document informing the policy and practice of all government departments working to uphold the safety and security of the UK and its people.⁴ Unlike the last two iterations, in 2020 the plan is for a far-reaching and integrated review of the UK’s foreign, security, defence and development policies. Redefining the UK’s place in the world after leaving the EU is the prompt for this re-look at our priorities and approach to national security.

The starting point of the current National Security Strategy is that the first duty of the state is the security of its people, or of the state itself: two competing interpretations of the word ‘nation’. The Strategy offers no definition of ‘security’ and arranges its priorities in three telling articulations of the ‘national interest’.⁵

The first is ‘protecting our people’, the defence of UK territory and people against foreign threats. This priority is standard fare, notwithstanding a heavy emphasis on military force and the anomaly of far-flung overseas territories to defend. The second and third definitions offer a more exceptional and elitist articulation of UK national interests: ‘projecting our global influence’ and ‘promoting our prosperity’, not least the trading interests of the British private sector. Herein lie some of the seeds of the ‘Global Britain’ idea of the UK as an almost transnational entity with interests unbound by geography and a special mission to project its benign influence. Its roots, of course, go far deeper into imperial Britain’s real and imagined past.

Shared security

A paradox lurks at the heart of the UK’s strategic approach. On the one hand, it is explicitly a *national* security strategy with the interests of a prescribed national population and territory at its core. On the other, it presumes a convergence of international interests with its own, what it terms the ‘rules-based international order’. This is an elastically liberal concept that the UK helped to create with its Global North peers in the mid-20th century and which it seeks to uphold through, *inter alia*, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the Bretton Woods financial institutions and various active military coalitions. Geographically, a special role is assumed for the UK in securing the global commons, not least international waters like the Strait of Hormuz. Arguably, this geographic privilege extends to the UK’s possession of nuclear weapons, the consequences of whose use would be inherently transnational.

The problem is not that the UK seeks to uphold an international legal order, nor that it favours the global leadership of strong multilateral institutions. Both ought to be at the heart of a values-based foreign policy. Rather, it is that the ambiguity of the ‘national interest’ permits selectivity in promoting global interests and a blindness to the UK’s privilege within an international system that it designed and upholds.

One way to address the tension between the UK’s presumed national and transnational interests and those of individual humans and humanity at large would be to adopt ‘shared security’ as an underpinning value for our future security, defence and foreign policy. We are, after all, globally interdependent when it comes to security. Pressing examples include climate change, conflict-induced forced migration, violent conflict and transnational crime; rarely is human insecurity contained by national boundaries.

⁴ Tim Ripley, *UK announces integrated security, defence and foreign policy review*, *Jane’s Defence Weekly*, December 2019, <https://www.janes.com/article/93263/uk-announces-integrated-defence-security-and-foreign-policy-review>

⁵ See Celia McKeon, *Contrasting Narratives: A Comparative Study of European and North American National Security Strategies*, *Rethinking Security*, March 2018, <https://rethinkingsecurityorguk.files.wordpress.com/2018/03/contrasting-narratives-march-2018.pdf>; and *National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review 2015: A Secure and Prosperous United Kingdom*, Cabinet Office, November 2015, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/555607/2015_Strategic_Defence_and_Security_Review.pdf

Shared security principles

Peace is therefore only sustainable when we see the well-being of others as being as important as our own. This is both a moral and a logical point: from the mountains of Afghanistan to the oil fields of Arabia we see disregard for other humans' well-being having real consequences for our own long-term security. To build sustainable peace the well-being of people in their social and ecological context should be the proper goal of security policy. The Rethinking Security network has suggested four principles for a sustained, shared approach to security:⁶

1. **Security as a freedom.** A shared freedom from fear and want, and the freedom to live in dignity. It implies social and ecological health rather than simply the absence of risk.
2. **Security as a common right.** Security should not, and usually cannot, be gained for one group of people at others' expense. Accordingly, it rests on solidarity rather than dominance – in standing with others, not over them.
3. **Security as a patient practice.** Security grows or withers according to how inclusive and just society is, and how socially and ecologically responsible we are. It cannot be coerced into being.
4. **Security as a shared responsibility.** Security is a common responsibility; its challenges belong to all of us and are too important to be entrusted to a self-selected group of powerful states.

A shared security approach would mean the consequences of UK policies on the rest of the world – whether trade ('prosperity'), military ('protection') or diplomatic ('influence') – would be explicitly considered and measured as if the security of people beyond our borders mattered as much as the security of those within them. Such an approach would limit the impetus to engage in unilateral foreign military interventions, burn coal or seal borders against asylum seekers, to cite three examples of unsustainable security practice.

A shared security approach would also have implications for the development, timing, resourcing and coordination of national security policy. First, for a security strategy to serve people rather than elites or an abstract state it must be open to consultation and critique by the people in whose name it is generated. Second, its timescale must be long-term, potentially open-ended, since peace and well-being must constantly be nurtured from deep roots to transform conflicts and prevent violence. Third, a shift to an approach that actively seeks to prevent violent conflict rather than suppress it would require an intentional shift in priorities, resources and strategies towards building human and ecological security and away from controlling and containing threats by military and security means.

Finally, shared security would provide a lens to improve coherence and coordination of policies pursued by different arms of government. It could, for example, address the dysfunctionality of one branch of government fighting a war while another patches up the resulting humanitarian crisis in the same country, or the tension between UK counter-terrorism laws impeding the work of UK-funded humanitarian and peacebuilding work.

Shared security practice

Adopting shared security as the lens for the new National Security Strategy could translate in practice into the central pursuit of peaceful, just and inclusive societies within UK foreign and security policy. This would follow through on leadership shown by the UK in 2015 in pressing for a comprehensive agenda in the 2030 UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to address the drivers of extreme poverty, including through Goal 16 and peace-related commitments.⁷ The current number, persistence and sheer scale of violent conflicts and their far-reaching consequences demand it too – the impact on

⁶ *Rethinking Security: A discussion paper*, Ammerdown Group, pp. 51–53, May 2016, <https://rethinkingsecurityorguk.files.wordpress.com/2016/10/rethinking-security-a-discussion-paper.pdf>

⁷ David Cameron, *PM's Speech to the UN Sustainable Development Goals Summit 2015*, September 2015, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-to-the-un-sustainable-development-goals-summit-2015>

human suffering, lost human and economic potential and regression in sustainable development are immense.⁸

The UK has existing assets to deploy in pursuit of a more peaceful world. There is extensive and respected expertise inside and outside government on diplomacy, conflict prevention and peacebuilding – a long history of thought leadership and global practice in this area. Moreover, it is an area that commands significant support from the UK public. In a national public opinion survey commissioned by Conciliation Resources in 2017, 71 per cent of respondents believed that peacebuilding plays a vital role in ending violent conflict; 60 per cent said that the UK should invest more in it.⁹ The overriding justification for this was a moral one: ‘human beings have the right to live in peace: free from conflict’.

Peacebuilding is the long-term process of understanding and addressing the underlying drivers of conflict, of transforming relationships that have been broken by violence, changing attitudes and establishing fairer institutions. It recognises our interdependence and is inclusive, involving everyone from communities to governments working to end fighting and prevent the recurrence of violence. It is the expression of patient practice in this vision of shared security.

More importantly, given the right policy environment and resourcing, it works. For all the visible examples of high-level success – peace agreements in Northern Ireland, Colombia, the Philippines after years of violence – there are countless, everyday successes achieved by people in all walks of life which go unnoticed, but which make up the long path to peace, and our mutual security.

In defining the ambition of the UK’s next National Security Strategy its authors would do well to learn from the humility of these everyday peacebuilders. They should recognise that the UK’s greatest contributions to national security could be to support over the long-term those people in societies who are building the foundations of inclusive and sustainable peace.

⁸ See for example, Institute for Economics & Peace, *Global Peace Index 2019: Measuring Peace in a Complex World*, June 2019, <http://visionofhumanity.org/app/uploads/2019/06/GPI-2019-web003.pdf>; and UNHCR, *Figures at a Glance*, June 2019, <https://www.unhcr.org/figures-at-a-glance.html>

⁹ Conciliation Resources, *Public support for peacebuilding: Attitudes towards peacebuilding and dialogue with armed groups in the UK, US and Germany*, September 2017, <https://www.c-r.org/resource/public-support-peacebuilding>



THE PATH TO REAL CLIMATE LEADERSHIP AT THE GLASGOW CLIMATE SUMMIT

Caroline Lucas MP¹

In November, the United Kingdom will host the most important United Nations climate summit since Paris, and its role is clear: this is the summit where the world has to narrow the gap between the aspirations of the Paris Agreement and countries' current commitments.²

Paris set a target of limiting global heating to well below 2°C while pursuing efforts to keep average global temperature rise to 1.5°C. What countries have pledged so far would deliver 3°C of warming – and that is if they even stuck to those promises. So the gap needs to be closed, and November's summit in Glasgow, COP26, is when this agreement needs to be struck.³ The stakes could hardly be higher.

The opportunity is there for the UK to reach out internationally in true climate leadership and begin to make reparations for the injustices of climate change, where the impacts fall hardest on those who have

¹ Caroline Lucas was first elected as Member of Parliament for Brighton Pavilion in 2010. She served as leader of the Green Party of England and Wales from 2008 to 2012, and Co-leader from 2016 to 2018. From 1999–2010 she served as one of the Party's first MEPs and represented the South East region until becoming the UK's first Green MP. As an MP, Caroline has served as Chair of the APPGs on Climate Change and Limits to Growth. She has been a Co-Chair of the APPGs on Fuel Poverty and Energy Efficiency and Democratic Participation, and Deputy Chair of the APPG on Renewable and Sustainable Energy. She has also been Vice Chair and Officer for numerous other APPGs. As an MP, Caroline has sat on Parliament's influential Environmental Audit Committee and has also sat on temporary committees set up to scrutinise Government legislation. Caroline's book, *Honourable Friends*, details her first parliamentary term as a fresh, green voice in the House of Commons. She also co-edited a book on cross-party working called *The Alternative*.

² The 2015 United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 21) negotiated and agreed the Paris Agreement: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>

³ The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Conference of Parties 26 (COP26).

done the least to cause the crisis. That means taking responsibility for the full impact of our trade, investments and influence in the world, making sure the voices of developing countries are heard at COP26, and providing support to smaller and less well-resourced Commonwealth countries.

At the time of writing, the signs do not look good. The preparations are mired in chaos, with Boris Johnson's original choice as President, former energy minister Claire O'Neill, sacked by Number 10 after little more than six months in the job.

There have also been squabbles with the Scottish government over access to buildings in Glasgow and rumours of a row over whether Scotland's first minister Nicola Sturgeon should have been offered a role.

After her sacking, Claire O'Neill pulled no punches. In an excoriating letter to the Prime Minister (PM), she wrote: 'We are miles off track. You promised to "lead from the front" and asked me what was needed "money, people, just tell us!" Sadly, these promises and offers are not close to being met.'⁴

There is a familiar pattern here of the UK's leadership on climate being talked up by the Government, while the reality is it does nothing like enough to deliver on its commitments. This is even more worrying since, if the summit is to be a success, it demands a huge amount of preparation – and we are running out of time to deliver it.

What makes the COP26 so important is not only the requirement that it results in countries being more ambitious in their emissions cuts – it is that the last two COPs, in Madrid and Katowice, have largely been failures. Paris stands out as the most successful climate summit in recent years, and there were good reasons for this.

In the year leading up to the summit, France focused all its diplomatic efforts on bringing 195 countries on board. The then French Foreign Minister, Laurent Fabius, got to grips with the scientific detail and oversaw a huge diplomatic mobilisation to get the Paris Agreement over the line. France's diplomatic corps arranged more than 900 climate-related events locally with government officials, companies and non-governmental organisations. Four senior roving ambassadors ensured every country was brought on board.

No wonder Christiana Figueres, the then executive secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), said French diplomacy had been 'amazing'.⁵ She recalled that, in her own travels leading up to the summit, she would often hear a knock on her hotel door to find the French ambassador outside telling her what had been achieved so far, and what remained to be done.

How much has our Foreign Office mobilised diplomatic effort behind the COP? I fear not enough, and time is running out.

The UK's presidency of the COP matters for another reason too. If we are to lead the effort to radically reduce carbon emissions, we have to get our own house in order, not only by being more ambitious about reaching our own interim targets, but also by being honest about what has and has not been achieved so far.

I have lost count of the number of times I have heard government ministers boast of the UK's performance in reducing our carbon emissions by 42 per cent compared to 1990 levels. This has been achieved almost entirely by driving coal out of electricity generation, which means that the biggest source of reductions so far has now been exhausted.

⁴ Claire O'Neill's resignation letter: <http://prod-upp-image-read.ft.com/9267af30-46c1-11ea-aeb3-955839e06441>

⁵ Anne-Sylvaine Chassany, *Fabius relies on his clout in quest for Paris climate deal*, *Financial Times*, November 2015, <https://www.ft.com/content/c2a54a0e-89fb-11e5-90de-f44762bf9896>

It also ignores the impact of emissions from consumption. If these are included, the government's own figures show our emissions have fallen just ten per cent in the last 30 years – a much more honest indicator of past performance and the scale of the future challenge.

As the Government's own advisers, the Committee on Climate Change, said in their 2019 Progress Report, outside the power sector, 'economy-wide progress was much less positive'.⁶

There is another, even more serious, flaw in the Government's claims of climate leadership: the target date of 2050 to achieve net zero emissions. It is far too late to address the climate emergency. When your house is on fire, you do not ask for a fire engine to come in 30 years' time. By that time, your house will have gone.

The 'net' in net zero is also a cover for a multitude of assumptions, many of them dangerously reckless, about the potential for negative emission technologies to suck carbon out of the atmosphere.⁷ These technologies are mostly unproven and, in some cases, unknown. So we are simply passing the problem on to our children and grandchildren for them to sort out.

The inter-generational injustice is clear. But there is another global injustice too: those who have done the least to cause the climate emergency are the ones who stand to lose the most.

By any measure of fairness, the UK has a clear responsibility to go faster than the global average, something acknowledged by the Prime Minister, who has said: 'We were the first to industrialise, so we have a responsibility to lead the way'.⁸

We also have a greater capability than most other countries, as the world's fifth-biggest economy and with a GDP per capita more than two-and-a-half times the global average.

If we are to have a reasonable chance of meeting the Paris Agreement target of 1.5°C, the IPCC estimates that the available global carbon budget is 420 gigatonnes of CO₂.⁹ Professor Tim Jackson of the Centre for the Understanding of Sustainable Prosperity at Surrey University estimates that the UK's fair share of this is 2.5 gigatonnes. On current trends, we will exceed this in 2026 and even earlier if we include emissions based on consumption.¹⁰

So a target date of 2050 for net zero cannot be said to be just. It will exacerbate the inequalities that climate change presents and further push the burden on to those who have done the least to cause it.

We and other rich nations have used so much of the world's carbon budget and the damage this has inflicted on our climate means that we are pulling up the ladder behind us, denying the Global South the opportunity to follow the path we have travelled.

Natural justice dictates that we must now support other countries to adapt to the growing impacts of climate change, and fairly compensate them for losses and damage where adaptation is no longer an option. If they are to avoid the fossil fuel route that we took, we need to help them with the clean technology that will allow them to raise their living standards without damaging the climate.

⁶ Committee on Climate Change, *Reducing UK emissions – 2019 Progress Report to Parliament*, July 2019, <https://www.theccc.org.uk/publication/reducing-uk-emissions-2019-progress-report-to-parliament/>

⁷ Kevin Anderson, *Brief response to the UK Government's "net-zero" proposal*, June 2019, <https://kevinanderson.info/blog/brief-response-to-the-uk-governments-net-zero-proposal/>

⁸ Chloé Farand, *UK's Boris Johnson urges all countries to set net zero emissions goals in 2020*, *Climate Home News*, February 2020, <https://www.climatechangenews.com/2020/02/04/uks-boris-johnson-urges-countries-set-net-zero-emissions-goals-2020/>

⁹ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), *Global Warming of 1.5°C*, October 2018, https://report.ipcc.ch/sr15/pdf/sr15_spm_final.pdf

¹⁰ The UK's remaining fair budget estimate is based on an adjusted per capita distribution of the remaining global carbon budget – with each person in the poorest half of the world given a 33 per cent higher budget than those in the richest half. This is quite a conservative estimate still – for a truly fair distribution it could be argued that the UK should have a smaller budget.

The UK is a leader in offshore wind and carbon capture and storage technologies. We must make these available for the poorest countries to harness cheaply. We should also immediately halt the taxpayer-supported financing of fossil fuel projects overseas. The UK has, finally, ended support for coal, but in the last five years more than £1.5 billion of UK export finance has gone into oil and gas projects.¹¹

At a UK-Africa investment summit in January, 90 per cent of the energy deals signed at the summit were for oil and gas projects.¹² This is climate hypocrisy, not climate leadership.

If we are to achieve this, COP26 has to be a success in both its ambition and its delivery. Madrid failed to secure agreement on the mechanisms for international cooperation, such as carbon markets. This needs to be resolved, but in a way that ensures fairness and equity for the Global South.

All peoples around the world, their children and their grandchildren, deserve to inhabit a safe environment. They deserve food security, resilient livelihoods and a sustainable future. The climate emergency is the biggest challenge facing us all. We are fast running out of time to tackle it. COP26 in Glasgow is an opportunity for the Government to show what 'Global Britain' actually means, in terms of climate leadership and a commitment to human rights and climate justice. There is a lot of ground to make up between now and November.

¹¹ Caroline Lucas, *Fossil Fuels: Export Credit Guarantees: Written Question – 5385*, Parliament, January 2020, <https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2020-01-20/5385/>

¹² Damian Carrington, *'Hypocrisy': 90% of UK-Africa summit's energy deals were in fossil fuels*, *The Guardian*, 20 January 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/jan/24/90-pe-cent-uk-africa-energy-deals-fossil-fuels>



DEVELOPMENT AND DIPLOMACY ARE KEY TO GLOBAL BRITAIN'S SUCCESS

Theo Clarke MP¹

Britain has long played a vital role in supporting international peace, security and prosperity. This has been a conscious choice on the part of our country – a recognition of both the socio-economic and moral sense that underpins a global, outward-looking approach to engaging with our neighbours. At the beginning of a new decade, we face a foundational shift in our world order. Britain's departure from the EU has necessitated a fundamental reappraisal of our international role, as understood through the prism of prosperity, security and diplomacy. As we stand at the cusp of this defining time in our history, we face a formidable challenge: to design a new foreign policy which reflects the rapidly changing demands of our era. I believe that the best way to address this challenge is to turn it into an opportunity for ourselves and our global partners. With a renewed mandate to define and deploy a forward-thinking foreign policy, we must recognise the central role that British aid should play as an engine for global development and prosperity.

UK aid helps the poorest and neediest in the world – those who often have nowhere else to turn. Over the years, British aid has helped make Mozambique landmine-free following decades of deadly war, saved 6.2 million people from dying of malaria globally and immunised 6.7 million children across the world against preventable diseases.² As these interventions demonstrate, when deployed effectively,

¹ Theo Clarke was elected MP for Stafford in 2019 and currently sits on the International Development Select Committee in the UK Parliament. She is the founder of The Coalition for Global Prosperity and former Director of the Conservative Friends of International Development. She has led the Conservative Party's social action project in Sierra Leone and has delivered education, enterprise and employability training in several African countries. She previously sat on the Board of Africa House London which promotes trade between the UK and emerging markets.

² Theo Clarke, *Read Our Essay in Bright Blue's Magazine on Britain as a force for good*, Coalition for Global Prosperity, 2018, <https://www.coalitionforglobalprosperity.com/blog/emergency-first-responder>

British aid can help shape a better world, save lives and improve the lives of and expectations for millions across the globe. In doing so, Britain sends out a clear message about the values we hold dear, whilst fulfilling our moral duty as a nation to support our neighbours far and wide. For these reasons, aid must play a key role in developing our future foreign policy.

The UK's aid budget helps to create a safer, healthier, more prosperous world, which directly benefits Britain. It is our international development efforts which enable British businesses to build new trading relations, create safety for British citizens at home and abroad, and empower our leaders and diplomats to collaborate on tackling global issues. With Africa's GDP set to hit \$3.2 trillion in the next five years, initiatives such as Africado are key to cultivating the wealth needed to build possible future trading markets for UK business.³ Developed with the support of UK foreign aid, Africado is now Tanzania's largest cultivator and exporter of avocados; Britain alone spends an average of \$144 million on avocados every year. Sustaining over 2,000 jobs for farmers in the East African country, Africado is a perfect demonstration of how UK aid is lifting living standards and creating opportunities to meaningfully tackle poverty. As a trading nation, Britain benefits when we stimulate global prosperity and growth. This is not an untested hypothesis. Whilst South Korea is a high-income country today, providing foreign direct investment, jobs and trade for the UK, it was once a recipient of aid too. In 2018 alone, trade between the UK and South Korea totalled £14.6 billion, making it one of the UK's most valuable partners in East Asia.⁴

Beyond trade, the UK's work in promoting global health is also protecting citizens at home as well as abroad. When Ebola broke out in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and previously in Sierra Leone, the UK was one of the first responders. I have seen first-hand in West Africa how UK aid played a leading role in mitigating one of the largest and most devastating outbreaks the modern world has seen. By dedicating resources to tackle the disease and halt its transmission, the UK has not only saved lives in the DRC, but also prevented possible deaths across the rest of the world, safeguarding British citizens worldwide.

Notably, UK aid is also protecting citizens of the UK and the world from the harms of social and political instability. UK aid in Somalia is a pertinent example of this in action. Following a spate of terrorism and coastal piracy in the country, in 2012 the UK started contributing to state-building, policing and local peace arrangements in areas newly liberated from Al-Shabaab.⁵ The UK approach was widely credited by experts, including the United Nations, and is now being followed by other international actors.⁶ This shows the power of UK leadership in stabilising a part of the world long plagued by insecurity and long known to promote instability abroad.

Lastly, development aid is crucial to building and sustaining the UK as a 'soft superpower' – a quality which British diplomats across the world value highly and utilise to great effect. UK aid flies the flag for Britain around the world and sends a clear message about Britain's values and role at the supranational level. This standing helps to cement the UK as a key figure on the global stage, sending a message of international solidarity, and building prestige and influence. It also helps build goodwill for the UK in communities around the world, who see the food, tents and other supplies that we distribute proudly marked with the Union Jack.

More directly, the UK's success in delivering aid has also made Britain a global leader and authority on development. The Department for International Development (DFID) is widely regarded to be one of the most effective distributors of international aid in the world. In 2018, the Aid Transparency Index, produced by Publish What You Fund, rated the department as the world's third-most effective aid

³ AgDevCo, Africado, *Investment Information*. <https://www.agdevco.com/our-investments/by-investment/Africado>; Theo Clarke, *Theresa May is right to focus on post-Brexit trading opportunities in Africa*, Coalition for Global Prosperity, 2018, <https://www.coalitionforglobalprosperity.com/blog/theresa-may-post-brexit-trading-africa>

⁴ BBC News, *UK and South Korea sign 'continuity' trade agreement*, August 2019, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-49430207>

⁵ ICAI, *UK aid in a conflict-affected country: Reducing conflict and fragility in Somalia*, June 2017, <https://icai.independent.gov.uk/html-report/uk-aid-conflict-affected-country-reducing-conflict-fragility-somalia/>

⁶ Ibid.

agency, out of 45 agencies analysed, categorising it ‘very good’ for its transparency and effectiveness.⁷ This expertise does not go unnoticed and helps maintain the UK’s standing as a key international player, helping Britain to leverage international debates, exert influence on international action and create relationships with growing powers.

So, as we begin to shape our new foreign policy, we must choose to be an open and cooperative partner. A new approach to foreign policy will ensure we can prosper, but it can only do so sustainably if we recognise Britain’s moral responsibility to lift standards of living and security in the process. Post-Brexit, as we chart a new course for our nation, it is through the significant contribution of UK aid – functioning alongside diplomacy, defence and trade – that we can preserve our reputation as a force for good. That is why, at this pivotal moment in our history, it is vital our leadership sets out a positive vision for UK aid as part of any comprehensive future foreign policy.

⁷ Publish What You Fund is an international campaign to build transparency in the aid sector. Publish What You Fund, *The 2018 Aid Transparency Index*, 2018, <https://www.publishwhatyoufund.org/the-index/2018/>; Bond, *DFID rated “very good”, FCO “poor”, in aid transparency index*, June 2018, <https://www.bond.org.uk/news/2018/06/dfid-rated-very-good-fco-poor-in-aid-transparency-index>



NARROWING THE GAP – THE CASE FOR DFID TO FOCUS MORE ON TACKLING INEQUALITY

Stephen Twigg¹

In January of this year, the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), Kristalina Georgieva, issued a powerful message about the impact of inequality on development. She described it as 'one of the most complex and vexing challenges in the global economy' over the past decade and emphasised the policies needed to address inequality, including progressive taxation, gender budgeting and social spending in key areas including education and health.

We have now entered the Decade of Delivery for Agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).² Goal Ten (SDG10) seeks to 'reduce inequality within and among countries'. The United Kingdom has been an important voice for international development, especially since the creation of the Department for International Development (DFID) in 1997. This heralded a period of growth in UK aid expenditure, culminating in legislation adopted in 2015 that legally commits the UK to spending 0.7 per cent of our national income on Official Development Assistance (ODA).

DFID has played a crucial role in tackling extreme poverty and hunger around the world. SDG1 aims to eradicate extreme poverty by 2030, building upon the progress made during the period of the

¹ Stephen Twigg served as the Labour and Co-operative Member of Parliament for Liverpool, West Derby from 2010 until 2019. He was the Chair of the UK House of Commons International Development Select Committee from June 2015 until standing down from Parliament in 2019. Between 2005 and 2010 he served as Director of the Foreign Policy Centre. He also worked for the Holocaust Centre and the Aegis Trust. He previously served as Member of Parliament for Enfield Southgate from 1997–2005. His ministerial and shadow ministerial roles have included Deputy Leader of the House of Commons, Education Minister, Shadow Education Secretary, Shadow Foreign Minister and Shadow Justice Minister.

² UN Sustainable Development Goals, <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>

Millennium Development Goals. The challenge now for governments and campaigners alike is to focus both on extreme poverty and on inequality. How might DFID go about doing this?

There is a strong argument that without tackling inequality, we will struggle to overcome poverty by 2030. The *World Inequality Report 2018* showed that, between 1980 and 2016, the poorest 50 per cent of people only received 12 cents in every dollar of global income growth. By contrast, the richest one per cent received 27 cents of every dollar.³

The first target in SDG10 (Reduced Inequalities) is to 'by 2030, progressively achieve and sustain income growth of the bottom 40 per cent of the population at a rate higher than the national average'. There is a longstanding debate about how to measure inequality most effectively in light of the evidence about patterns of income distribution in different societies.

Chilean economist José Gabriel Palma found that the 'middle 50 per cent' (those with a household income between the fifth and ninth deciles) have a proportion of national income that is relatively stable and close to 50 per cent, whereas the division between the top ten per cent and the bottom 40 per cent varies considerably.⁴ Therefore, to put it simply, Palma's argument is that the level of inequality is determined by the distribution of what we might call the 'other 50 per cent' of income – how much goes to the top ten per cent and how much goes to the bottom 40 per cent?

In 2013, the Centre for Global Development (CGD) outlined a possible new measure of inequality: the Palma ratio between the top ten per cent and the bottom 40 per cent. Oxfam has proposed that the UK and other nations should set clear, targeted plans to reduce the gap between the rich and poor as expressed in the Palma ratio using what they term the 'Palma Premium' – the extent to which the incomes of the poorest 40 per cent are growing faster than the richest ten per cent.⁵

I recommend that DFID does some further work on how the Palma Premium concept could assist the UK's efforts to promote the SDGs and how best to combine it with the important continued focus on eliminating extreme poverty. I recognise that there are serious challenges here, including the availability of reliable data, but the potential prize is a big one if we are going to make a reality of the slogan 'Leave No One Behind' that is attached to the SDGs.

There is a compelling argument to enshrine this in UK law, which would strengthen our existing legislation on international development. Under the 2002 International Development Act, DFID spending must be 'likely to contribute to a reduction in poverty'. It would be a straightforward change to add 'and inequality' to the legislation and to be explicit that this would apply to all Official Development Assistance by the UK – whether delivered by DFID or other government departments.

Legislation alone, however, is not sufficient. There is a strong case for a focus by DFID on SDG10 in the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review and for it to feature prominently in the UK's next Voluntary National Review to the United Nations. I hope my successor as Chair of the International Development Committee might pursue this.

The focus of this chapter is what DFID can do to address inequality. It is worth making the point, however, that the UK has its own domestic challenges on inequality and we can learn some lessons from other European countries with lower Palma ratios, including Sweden and the Netherlands. As the UK Government's own Voluntary National Review said in 2019, 'The Palma ratio has ... fallen slightly over this period. Despite this, the UK has the sixth highest level of income inequality in the OECD'.

³ Facundo Alvaredo, et al, *The World Inequality Report 2018*, World Inequality Lab, December 2017, <https://wir2018.wid.world/>

⁴ The idea was first raised in the journal *Development and Change*: José Gabriel Palma, *Homogeneous Middles vs. Heterogeneous Tails, and the End of the 'Inverted-U': It's All About the Share of the Rich*, *Development and Change*, 87–153, April 2011, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2011.01694.x>. For more recent analysis of the ratio see: IBEI, *José Gabriel Palma re-examines the 'Palma Ratio' at the IBEI*, October 2016, <https://www.ibei.org/en/jose-gabriel-palma-re-examines-the-palma-ratio-at-the-ibei> 46738

⁵ See for example: Chiara Mariotti and Claire Spoons, *Fighting Inequality to Beat Poverty: The role of UK international development*, Oxfam GB, June 2019, <https://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/fighting-inequality-to-beat-poverty-the-role-of-uk-international-development-620763>

Of course, agreeing a DFID inequality indicator is just one step forward – albeit an important one. Alongside such an indicator it is crucial that we take an evidence-based approach to the policies that could contribute to a more equal distribution of income. Investment in health, education and social security systems is a critical element here. Properly resourced public services are essential to the achievement of SDG10, and I urge DFID and other donors to continue to give high priority to working with the least developed countries towards universal health coverage, high quality education and social protection systems.

However, money alone will not be enough. Take education. There is a big set of issues around the quality of education and the importance of having reliable data on which to assess progress. I know from my previous experience as Minister for Schools that inequality is a major challenge with significant differences both between schools and within schools. This affects many sections of society but can be especially significant for disabled children and children with Special Education Needs.

SDG10's second target is to 'by 2030, empower and promote the social, economic and political inclusion of all, irrespective of age, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, origin, religion or economic or other status'. Disability-inclusive development is vitally important if we are to address exclusion and tackle inequality.

DFID has done some excellent work on the education of women and girls, which reminds us that we will not seriously overcome inequality until we empower women and girls. So far, I have focused on Global Goals 1 and 10 – tackling extreme poverty and inequality. Let me turn now to SDG5: to 'achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls'. This goal is both of paramount intrinsic importance and is vital to the other goals. We cannot achieve sustainable development without a fundamental change in the lives of women and girls.

Earlier I referred to the recent remarks of the IMF's Kristalina Georgieva and her emphasis on gender budgeting. Women's economic empowerment is essential to lasting development and greater social and economic equality. Gender budgeting is where fiscal policy is used proactively in support of gender equality. DFID has funded the IMF's review of tax and public expenditure policies against how they promote gender equality. There is considerable scope to learn from and build upon this work.

Legislation in this area was strengthened by Conservative MP Bill Cash in his excellent 2014 International Development (Gender Equality) Act, which was passed with strong cross-party support.⁶ Six years on from this, I urge DFID to review the impact of the Act on DFID's work, on ODA-eligible programmes run by other government departments and in multilaterals. The UK has shown real leadership in this area but as the recent Independent Commission for Aid Impact review into the UK's Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative shows, it is critical that leadership is sustained if lasting change is to be achieved.⁷ The Prime Minister's strong personal commitment to girls' education is an encouraging example of such leadership.

I have sought to emphasise two priorities for DFID: the importance of a clear indicator on economic inequality and the centrality of gender to development. Important policy considerations follow from these two priorities including:

- the importance of policies being shaped by communities at the sharp end of inequality. This means strengthening the voices of the Global South in international institutions and ensuring that the most marginalised are heard, including refugees and the internally displaced;
- the availability of good, secure jobs and workplace rights. Trades unions and businesses are essential partners in achieving sustainable development;
- economic development strategies that explore alternative business models, including a greater role for co-operatives and other forms of social enterprise;

⁶ UK Government, *International Development (Gender Equality) Act 2014*, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/9/contents/enacted>

⁷ Independent Commission for Aid Impact, *The UK's Preventing Sexual Violence in Conflict Initiative*, January 2020, <https://icai.independent.gov.uk/report/psvi/>

- progressive taxation, which requires countries to be able to mobilise domestic resources and for wealthy individuals and profitable companies to pay their fair share; and
- remittances, which play a vital role in development, together with a much greater focus on reducing associated transaction costs.

The challenge now is to build a strong alliance of commitment to tackling the scourge of inequality. DFID is crucial here, but the challenge is for the Government as a whole. If the Prime Minister takes the lead on a sustained effort by the UK to deliver on SDG10, he would attract cross-party support and mobilise civil society here and internationally. It would, surely, be a powerful signal of the UK taking seriously our role in a changing world.



A FEMINIST FOREIGN POLICY: WHAT WOULD IT MEAN FOR THE UK?

Marissa Conway¹

Fresh on the heels of Brexit, the landscape of British foreign policy is infused with uncertainty. We are entering a new chapter of British politics and culture, and in the face of overwhelming change and unfamiliarity, the pull to revert to the known is strong. Unfortunately for the United Kingdom, our 'known' includes a violent history of colonisation and domination through foreign policy. Politicians like Prime Minister Boris Johnson have cited the opportunity for a 'Global Britain' now that we are outside of the European Union.² This 'Global Britain', so it goes, gives the UK the chance to restore ourselves to our historical place at the top of the global hierarchy. But what goes unsaid in these sound bites is that this position of power came and continues to come at the expense of the quality of life and the actual lives of those both at home and abroad who do not fit a patriarchal mould of the status quo; in other words, for those who were not English-born white men. For example, the Windrush scandal cast a harsh spotlight on the way in which formerly colonised people of colour who are legally entitled to reside in the UK were forced to leave or were detained. Many also lost their jobs and homes or were refused healthcare and social assistance they legally should have been able to access.³

¹ Marissa Conway is the Co-Founder of the Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy and a current doctoral candidate earning her PhD in Politics at the University of Bristol. She is on the Forbes 30 Under 30 list. Follow her on Twitter: [@marissakonway](https://twitter.com/marissakonway)

² BBC News, *Boris Johnson: First speech as PM in full*, July 2019, <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-49102495>

³ Steve Valdez-Symonds, *Seventy Years After Windrush*, Amnesty International UK, April 2018, https://www.amnesty.org.uk/blogs/yes-minister-it-human-rights-issue/seventy-years-after-windrush?qclid=Cj0KCQiAs67yBRC7ARIsAF49CdUMs1ralFtMQkPJ7WWFFQvXVI-udPY0ZDqJxwDQ39ntpKvCy_M9cgkaAtz3EALw_wcB

Brexit, with all its upheavals, does present a chance to hit reset and break such a historical pattern of trauma and violence both abroad and at home. We now have an opportunity to re-envision foreign policy in a way we have never conceived of it before, and it is going to take more than reappointing positions when politicians fall short. Now that we are outside of the political structures of the EU, how will we craft our legacy? I believe the UK can be a leader in building peace through its foreign policy not by means of claiming power over others, but by adopting a strong ethical framework to guide its decision-making in order to set a new international standard for placing human rights at the centre of policy. And there is no better way to do so than by adopting a feminist foreign policy.

What is a feminist foreign policy?

A feminist foreign policy (FFP) is a relatively new political framework, first introduced and adopted by Sweden in 2014.⁴ Theirs focuses on three Rs: Rights, Representation, and Resources for women and girls. Though initially a state-generated approach to foreign policy, civil society has since taken the idea and run with it, working to fill out its theoretical foundation and offering a more radical interpretation of what FFP can mean for any given country.⁵ The general consensus is that FFP is most concerned with the human impact of foreign policy and actively works to create policies that are helpful and not hurtful. It does this by building out political systems which are oriented towards achieving equality, justice and solidarity and rejects patriarchal values like racism, capitalism and imperialism. The 'feminist' part of FFP calls in intersectional, decolonial and anti-racist principles to this work, which are built on an extensive history of activism and campaigning for women's rights. Setting feminist values as the filter through which decisions are made means that FFP centres the needs of vulnerable people (who are often the most impacted by foreign policy) as the most important aspect of all policymaking processes. For example, under an FFP framework, immigration policymakers would work directly with asylum seekers to create the most supportive systems for those in need of a new home.

It is important to note that though FFP originated in Sweden as a means to fortify women's rights, it has already evolved to be understood as a framework that works for everyone. It is primarily concerned with the rights and needs of people who are marginalised for a wide variety of reasons beyond their gender identity. This includes race, class and ability, to name a few. In order to do this, FFP investigates power dynamics and seeks to address how foreign policy fashions power as hierarchical between both people and states. This hierarchy is sustained by patriarchal values and functions best when an elite few sit alone at the top. Between people, this commonly looks like Eton- and Oxbridge-educated white men making decisions that impact the rest of the population, even though these men are unlikely to ever experience the impacts of their decisions themselves. Between states, it looks like Permanent Members (P5) of the Security Council, who are also nuclear weapon-possessing nations, holding the ultimate veto power over anything they might not like.

This is not to say that it is written in the stars that all P5 states are doomed to cause violence to others, or that all Oxbridge-educated white men can only ever be bad policymakers. Rather, it means recognising we all participate in a system in which power is skewed dramatically in a specific direction and taking the responsibility to address this in a meaningful way. All of us most likely occupy some position of power, and so have a duty to constantly reflect on how we can better wield it to help, not harm, our world. Through an FFP framework, the questioning of these power imbalances becomes institutionalised in policy practices, and by focusing on fulfilling the needs of the most vulnerable first we begin to flip this hierarchy on its head and make equality a reality.

⁴ Ministry for Foreign Affairs, *Feminist Foreign Policy*, Government Offices of Sweden, <https://www.government.se/government-policy/feminist-foreign-policy/>

⁵ For a complete list of current writing and research on feminist foreign policy, see the Centre for Feminist Foreign Policy's Feminist Foreign Policy Reading List: <https://centreforfeministforeignpolicy.org/feminist-foreign-policy>

A UK feminist foreign policy

Foreign policy has the potential to be a mechanism by which we create a world free from violence. Britain sits as a Permanent Member on the Security Council and is a nuclear weapon-possessing nation, and so operates its foreign policy from a place of considerable influence.⁶ Wielding this power wisely means ensuring that those who historically have been othered, ignored or exploited are meaningfully included in policymaking. We are seeing interest and steps in the right direction by the UK Government through its National Action Plan for Women, Peace and Security, and its Preventing Sexualised Violence Initiative, for example. Though it is arguable that both of these are struggling to be meaningful and sustainable as political attention frequently wanders, it is clear that there is already momentum within the Government to make the principles behind FFP more prominent in policy work. In fact, the Labour Party and Women's Equality Party have also both expressed interest in FFP.⁷ While promising, it is important that any work in this field seeks systemic change, rather than just addressing the symptoms of inequality. Ultimately, FFP means that the thoughts and opinions of an elite few who will not experience the consequences of their own decisions should never be the driver behind decisions around issues like economic sanctions, arms sales or immigrant detention time.

FFP is more than throwing a few women or people of colour into political leadership and calling it a day. It is oriented towards a complete systemic overhaul of politics as we know it. It is not necessarily easy work and requires introspection and self-reflection about the way in which UK foreign policy is paradoxical as, for example, it funds peacekeeping initiatives to resolve conflict while selling arms which fuel that very conflict in the first place. Colonial legacies in particular are held front and centre under the microscope of FFP as something that has been deeply harmful on a large scale and is in need of reparations.

So what can we do today to set the UK on a path towards a more sustainably peaceful world? The first step to thinking about UK policy under an FFP framework involves a feminist analysis of power and asking for any given issue area, 'Who has power?' 'Who does not?' 'Why do these dynamics exist?' This analytical exercise begins to peel back the surface layers of political agendas and exposes vulnerability, sites of exploitation and patriarchal patterns. Once this information is gathered, the second step involves reimagining the goal of all current policy as achieving solidarity, justice and equality. How would trade policy change if it was less concerned with capital and more concerned with protecting exploited workers' rights? How do ideas about security and the arms trade change if we seek to stand in true solidarity with victims of conflict?

Though originating from decades of feminist activism and academia, FFP as a state-implemented political framework is still remarkably new and many of the questions framed in this article have yet to be addressed. However, today's feminists are continuing to push the envelope. Both globally and in the UK, we are on the cusp of a new wave of foreign policy thinking and action, and what this means for any given context requires a great deal more research and discussion. What is clear is that an FFP framework would dramatically change the landscape of UK politics for the better and make sustainable peace a real possibility.

⁶ United Nations Security Council Members, United Nations, <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/security-council-members>; Nuclear Threat Initiative: United Kingdom, (updated October 2016), <https://www.nti.org/learn/countries/united-kingdom/>

⁷ Preet Gill MP, *Preet Gill: Labour's feminist foreign policy would take on gender-based violence in all its forms*, *The House*, Politics Home, January 2019, <https://www.politicshome.com/news/uk/foreign-affairs/house/house-magazine/101069/preet-gill-labours-feminist-foreign-policy-would>; Women's Equality Party UK, Twitter post, September 2018, https://twitter.com/WEP_UK/status/1038727838415953920



PUTTING WELL-BEING AND THE INTERESTS OF FUTURE GENERATIONS AT THE HEART OF FOREIGN POLICY

Sophie Howe¹

Our world is uncertain. Our political system is uncertain. Our people are uncertain. Whether we look at Brexit, tensions between the Middle East and the United States, technological advancements, climate change or any other potentially detrimental international area of concern, we see an unpredictable future. Our current system is failing us and we need change.

The answer lies in values. A values-based foreign policy would allow for an international landscape of cooperation and action rather than countries constantly grappling for pole position in global markets and arguing over natural resources. If every individual nation was globally responsible, the world would look after itself. If each country took responsibility for its consumption and emissions, for its greed and exploitative international trade relationships, for the narrow-mindedness of politicians and governments

¹ Sophie Howe is the Future Generations Commissioner for Wales. The world's only Future Generations Commissioner, her role is to provide advice to the Government and other public bodies in Wales on delivering social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being for current and future generations and assessing and reporting on how they are delivering. Since taking up the role in 2016, she has represented Wales at the UN, the OECD and on a number of international forums, including chairing the Network of Institutions for Future Generations. Prior to this role Sophie was the first Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for South Wales. She has also served as an Adviser to two Welsh First Ministers providing policy and political advice on communities, local government, equality and community safety, where she led the development of Wales' first legislation to tackle violence against women and girls. Sophie was an elected Councillor for nine years and she wrote the 2009 report of the Councillors Commission, which led to legislative reforms on increasing diversity amongst elected members. She has a background in equality and diversity, having managed the legal department of the Equal Opportunities Commission. Sophie is named in the top 100 Business Women in Wales. She is a fellow at Cardiff University Business School and Swansea University, holds an Honorary Doctorate from the University of Wales Trinity Saint David, and has a degree in law and politics.

so intent on being popular they lose sight of their own ideals, goals and capabilities for real progressive change, we could create a future of certainty and hope. As leaders in today's world, we need to understand how placing well-being and protecting the interests of future generations at the heart of foreign policy can provide a platform for progressive change and allow us to create a future we look forward to being a part of – a future we are proud to say we helped to shape.

People's attitudes are changing. Whilst in some areas the changes could be seen as regressive, in many others we are seeing more progressive ideologies and expectations, often driven by younger generations who are less prejudiced, more concerned about the planet and more focused on having a life well-lived than a bank account well-fed.² This push for change in the UK creates a platform for the younger generation to be heard. Wales itself has created a youth parliament and recently passed a Senedd Elections Bill reducing the voting age in these elections to include 16- and 17-year-olds.³ We are seeing a suite of these new laws accommodating the voices and views of the next generation and it is vital that we listen to these voices if we are to safeguard their futures against our past mistakes.

As future generations begin to be included in the process of shaping their own societies, the people with the power must show that their inclusion is not a token gesture but a genuine step towards protecting them from the damage that is being done. We as leaders cannot fall victim to what Matthew Syed terms 'cognitive dissonance': 'when mistakes are too threatening to admit to, so they are reframed or ignored...the internal fear of failure: how we struggle to admit mistakes to ourselves'.⁴ Future generations have a right to meet their needs and we must overcome our fear of failure to allow their success. Whether we look at obesity, climate change, poverty or any other major threat the human race faces, we need political infrastructure that is conducive to action. As leaders, we cannot afford not to try.

It would be unfair, both to our peers and to our descendants, to give in to ignorance and scorn the clear demand from the new generation of British people for more action on many globally consequential problems. Extinction Rebellion membership hit 100,000 in 2019 and the UK Government declared a climate emergency after huge public pressure to officially recognise the issue.⁵ There has been increasing public outcry at the marginalisation of certain groups in society, with one in 50 UK households being forced to resort to food banks in 2018–19 as over three million food parcels were given out.⁶ We have also seen a rise in the number of social businesses as the economy slowly starts to merge with notions of social value. Consumers are becoming increasingly morally conscientious and are channelling their money into worthwhile causes and businesses that take into account the consequences of their actions, with social enterprises contributing £60bn to the UK economy and employing two million people.⁷

This push towards more sustainable action in all walks of public life means that policymakers and governments are being pressured to push these issues to the top of their agenda.

Wales is a leader in this area. To tackle the age-old problem of short-term decision-making, the National Assembly for Wales drafted a groundbreaking piece of legislation centring well-being and

² Eating Better, *Climate change top concern for British teenagers*, November 2019, <https://www.eating-better.org/blog/climate-change-top-concern-for-british-teenagers>; Matthew Jenkin, *Millennials want to work for employers committed to values and ethics*, *The Guardian*, November 2015, <https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/2015/may/05/millennials-employment-employers-values-ethics-jobs>

³ Welsh Youth Parliament, <https://www.youthparliament.wales>; National Assembly for Wales, Senedd and Elections (Wales) Act 2020, <http://www.senedd.assembly.wales/mglIssueHistoryHome.aspx?lId=23754>

⁴ Syed, M., *Black box thinking: The surprising truth about success*, London: Hachette UK, September 2015, <https://www.hachette.com.au/matthew-syed/black-box-thinking-the-surprising-truth-about-success>

⁵ BBC News, *Extinction Rebellion 'stemmed from failed bus lane protest'*, September 2019, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-49513802>; BBC News, *UK Parliament declares climate change emergency*, May 2019, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-48126677>

⁶ Patrick Butler, *Welfare changes drive rising poverty and food bank use, study finds*, *The Guardian*, November 2019, <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2019/nov/05/welfare-changes-key-factor-rising-poverty-food-bank-use-study-finds>

⁷ Barclays Business Banking, *Start with purpose: Putting social purpose at the heart of your new venture*, <https://www.barclays.co.uk/business-banking/business-insight/start-up-with-purpose/>

future generations in the minds of every sector in Wales: The Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (WFGA).⁸ This act requires each of the 44 main public bodies in Wales (health boards, local authorities, fire and rescue services, national bodies like Sport Wales and Natural Resources Wales and, significantly, the Welsh Government itself) to take decisions ‘in a way which meets today’s needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs’. It sets out seven national well-being goals that as a nation we are aspiring to, and five ways of working that public bodies must demonstrate in how they operate: longer-term, prevention, collaboration, integration and involvement.

As the Future Generations Commissioner for Wales, I monitor and advise public bodies on their compliance with the Act and strive to push everyone in Wales to live and act more sustainably. Although I describe this work as an expedition rather than a journey, the Act is beginning to drive change. Just recently, Transport for Wales released a Sustainable Development Plan ‘closely aligned with the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) 2015 Act’, and their recent procurement of a £5 billion rail franchise for Wales, supported by my Office, required companies bidding for the franchise to demonstrate how they would not just deliver a faster, cleaner, greener rail service in Wales, but how they would contribute to each one of our well-being goals.⁹ Many initiatives have been undertaken as a result these actions: for example, employing Customer and Community Ambassadors to encourage a greater sense of community; addressing socio-economic disadvantage with cheaper fares for more deprived areas; supporting social enterprises in running their operations on a local level; or providing bicycle storage and well-lit walking routes to stations to encourage physically active travel.

Following in Wales’ footsteps is crucial if Britain is to deviate from its prevailing and potentially catastrophic course. Do we really want to be responsible for a future of economic decline, irreversible environmental damage and nation-wide societal divisions? We cannot go down in history as the generation who stood by and let the world spiral. We must be remembered as dutiful ancestors who stood up and changed the course of history for the better.

The most important way of achieving this is changing mindsets and creating a paradigm shift. The outdated economic model of exponential growth and trading one form of capital for another, certainly at the cost of the planet and often at the cost of its people, must be challenged – something which is recognised in the Welsh legislation and other leading countries such as New Zealand and Finland in making their shift to well-being economics. As Chair of the Network of Institutions for Future Generations, I work with several international organisations in calling for countries to legislate on behalf of future generations. An example of this work can be seen in the United Arab Emirates’ Well-being Strategy 2030, a product of several meetings between myself and the UAE administration, which reflects the principles of our WFGA. I have also worked closely with colleagues in other countries, such as Norway, New Zealand, South Korea, Australia and Canada, along with much high-level institutional collaboration with the United Nations and the OECD to promote sustainable development and well-being.

Despite this promising international cooperation and discussion, there is still a huge tanker full of vested interests to turn if this approach is to become mainstream. The public will have to up the ante and move beyond Veganuary or donating to food banks and really start to demand a fundamental change to the economic status quo if politicians are to change the policymaking habits of a lifetime.

In Wales, our legally binding duties represent both a response to public demand and a bravery of political leadership, which I think shows more than just green shoots of optimism. This approach represents the beginnings of a potentially revolutionary political shift and should also apply to Britain more generally. This may actually be the one thing British party leaders can agree on, given that in the build-up to the December 2019 election each of the major party leaders signed the Future Generations

⁸ Future Generations: Commissioner for Wales, Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, <https://futuregenerations.wales/about-us/future-generations-act/>

⁹ Transport for Wales, *Sustainable Development Plan*, <https://tfwrail.wales/sustainable-development-plan>

Pledge in support of Lord Bird's Future Generations Bill.¹⁰ Looking to emulate Wales's example, should the Bill be passed, there would be a Future Generations Commissioner for the UK working to bring about progressive and sustainable change in Westminster and British politics.

This Future Generations Pledge is a positive first step; however, more needs to be done. We are not expecting immediate overnight results, but we need to continue in the right direction and establish the infrastructure necessary to create the real change we are championing here. This is the point of a values-based approach. We want to induce action and long-term planning that can give future leaders and their societies the capabilities to deal with their problems and their past, which is our present.

Wales provides a shining example of a country attempting to change the attitude of its policymakers through its WFGA. As Britain attempts to find its role in an ever-changing and uncertain world, it must look at this example and follow in Wales' footsteps by placing values and the needs of future generations at the top of its agenda.

¹⁰ John Bird, *John Bird: Let's rewrite the future with a Future Generations Bill*, *The Big Issue*, October 2019, <https://www.bigissue.com/latest/john-bird-lets-rewrite-the-future-with-a-future-generations-bill/>

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS¹

Adam Hug, Dr Abigael Baldoumas, Katy Chakraborty and Dr Danny Sriskandarajah

The extent to which the United Kingdom is to be taken seriously on the world stage post-Brexit will depend significantly on whether it has the confidence to stand up for what it says it believes in, or risk its focus on trade being seen as a sign of weakness and inexorable decline. There is a widely shared fear, particularly in the short to medium term as the UK completes its conscious uncoupling from the European Union, that commercial considerations will overwhelm other priorities. If the UK is seen to ignore its stated values and wider strategic interests in pursuit of new trade deals, the Brexit process will have diminished the UK's standing in the world rather than marking the start of a new and more vibrant chapter. The UK must aspire to be more than simply a cold, wet Dubai.

A whole-government approach to the UK's foreign policy is to be welcomed. However, it is important to ensure that the UK's values do not get lost amid inter-departmental wrangling; they must instead be mainstreamed to all those involved in policy-making and delivery. A joined-up government should not come at the expense of the world's poorest people or those facing human rights abuses and conflict.

The UK has an opportunity to articulate a powerful vision for 'Global Britain' that is defined by commitments to human rights, inclusive representation at home and abroad, and by the ways it uses resources to have the greatest impact on poverty and inequality. The current Foreign Secretary has said that the 'guiding lights' for the current integrated policy review 'will be free trade, democracy, human rights and the international rule of law'.² Different stakeholders and political actors will have different views about what should be contained in such a statement of values, but whatever the government decides, a clear, concise declaration that enumerates the key principles would be very helpful. Authors in this collection have set out potential principles for such a declaration including ensuring policy alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); ensuring wider representation of women, young people and marginalised communities (both from the UK and our partners in the Global South) in the policy development process; and ensuring that policies uphold longstanding goals around support for democracy, the rule of law and human rights. Baroness Anelay has written about the need to incorporate the 'Ruggie Principles' on business and human rights into the UK trade agenda.³ Stephen Twigg has spoken in detail about the need for a clear set of indicators on economic inequality and the centrality of gender to development to assess policy impact. Marissa Conway makes the case that a feminist foreign policy would provide a strong ethical framework to guide decisions and set a new international standard. The Government's Integrated Security, Defence and Foreign Policy Review should help define and refine these principles into a clear and codified statement of the values of 'Global Britain' that would give an unambiguous signal to the international community and to stakeholders across the Government.

Building on such a statement of values, the Government should consider enhancing existing consultation practices by setting a 'Global Britain' values test for all major policy and spending decisions with an international dimension, including trade deals. This would set out the Government's impact assessment of how each decision will affect the goals enumerated in the 'Global Britain' values statement and examine its implications for the needs of future generations and the most vulnerable people in the world. The results of this assessment should then be published ahead of decisions being taken to encourage feedback, input and scrutiny from Parliament, key stakeholders and the wider public.

¹ While the conclusions and recommendations set out here may reference ideas raised by individual essay contributors they do not necessarily reflect their views. The ideas set out here are those of the editors alone and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Foreign Policy Centre, Oxfam GB or the other contributors.

² FCO and The Rt Hon Dominic Rabb MP, *Foreign Secretary's introduction to the Queen's Speech debate*, January 2020, <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/foreign-secretary-introduction-to-queens-speech-debate>

³ Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, *UN "Protect, Respect and Remedy" Framework and Guiding Principles*, <https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/un-secretary-generals-special-representative-on-business-human-rights/un-protect-respect-and-remedy-framework-and-guiding-principles>

Keeping in mind the ideals of good governance, transparency and accountability that the UK looks to promote abroad, the Government should think carefully about how it develops new decision-making processes. It should rethink its current approach that limits parliamentary accountability and public scrutiny over trade deals. Given past critiques of decision-making in the EU when the UK was a member, new processes in Westminster should not be less publicly accountable than the processes for scrutiny by the European Parliament, Member States and public that it has just left. As proposed by Ruth Bergan and Dr Emily Jones, the government should publish its draft negotiating mandates (with headline information about priorities); the International Trade Select Committee or a new Trade Scrutiny Committee needs to be involved in regular dialogue with ministers and officials with scope for proper scrutiny on the progress of ongoing negotiations; and the agreed trade deals should be subject to a proper debate and approval vote in Parliament.⁴ Similarly, new UK trade deals should have at least as strong human rights clauses as the deals being done by the EU and where possible it should seek to strengthen them.

While developing its own foreign policy independent of the EU, the UK still needs to show it is willing to work with like-minded partners. This will not only involve seeking to build a strong foreign policy and security partnership with the EU as part of the post-Brexit process, but it should also seek to enhance or create a range of bilateral mechanisms with Member States that augment, but do not seek to replace, relationships with the EU, such as UK-France defence cooperation under the Lancaster House Treaties and continued involvement in the E3 group on Iran.⁵ As Lord McConnell argues, the UK must also seek to deepen relations with countries who share similar values and not-dissimilar strategic positions, such as Canada, Japan and New Zealand, with the UK-Canadian joint Campaign on Media Freedom being an important example of the potential for joint working.⁶ The UK will also need to retain an active presence at international forums to project its continuing global role – as Rt Hon Tobias Ellwood points out, the absence of senior ministers from the February 2020 Munich Security Conference was not seen as a good sign by Britain's international partners.

Alongside new state-level alliances, the government should reaffirm its commitment to working in partnership with civil society. Civil society networks reinforce and deepen state-level cooperation. Many of the authors in this collection highlight the role of civil society in tackling so many of the challenges facing the world today: Baroness Anelay on delivering international development goals; Jonathan Cohen, Dr Theresa Dumasy and Richard Reeve on peacebuilding and security; Marissa Conway on shaping values-based foreign policy; Ruth Bergen and Dr Emily Jones on trade; and Sophie Howe on sustainable societies. Globally, restrictions on civil society space are increasing,⁷ but the government should ensure that its own actions, including counter-terrorism agendas, do not inadvertently restrict civil society space further.

A clear focus on continued engagement in the UK's neighbourhood aligns with its capabilities, the threats it faces and its opportunities. Given the pressure on Europe's eastern flank from Russia, the UK should continue to show its support for the Baltic States and other NATO Member States, as well as with Ukraine. There will also be scope to show renewed and enhanced engagement with NATO, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the Council of Europe (CoE), working within them to reform their processes and ensure that they meet both their founding objectives

⁴ For more background see: Trade Justice Movement, *Securing democracy in UK Trade policy*, November 2017, https://www.tjm.org.uk/documents/briefings/0870_TJM_SECURING_DEMOCRACY_2019_PRFF1.pdf

⁵ Ministry of Defence, *UK and France defence cooperation*, September 2018, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-and-france-defence-cooperation>; Prime Minister's Office, 10 Downing Street and The Rt Hon Boris Johnson MP, *E3 statement on the JCPoA: 12 January 2020*, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/e3-statement-on-the-jcpoa-12-january-2020>

⁶ There are of course a number of caveats raised about the lack of clear actions being taken from the work so far as highlighted by campaign groups such as: Article 19, *UK: Government must take more action on media freedom*, September 2019, <https://www.article19.org/resources/uk-government-must-take-more-action-on-media-freedom/>; Foreign Affairs Select Committee, *Liberty is under attack as journalists are silenced, say MPs*, UK Parliament, September 2019, <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/foreign-affairs-committee/news-parliament-2017/global-media-freedom-report-published-17-19/>

⁷ Danny Sriskandarajah, *Under threat: five countries in which civic space is rapidly closing*, Open Democracy, January 2018, <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/openglobalrights-openpage/under-threat-five-countries-in-which-civic-space-is-rapi/>

and the values and priorities which the UK is seeking to promote.⁸ It will be important to ensure that the contentious domestic debate about the way in which the European Convention on Human Rights is incorporated into British law through the Human Rights Act takes place in a way that does not undermine the UK's commitment to the Convention itself nor the UK's membership of the CoE, or further encourage other CoE members to ignore their responsibilities under the Convention.⁹

One way to show that the UK is not being overly cowed by commercial constraints will be ensuring that UK ambassadors feel supported and encouraged to speak out on human rights and other abuses taking place in the countries where they are posted. Such actions should often be coordinated with other like-minded partners to benefit from strength in numbers, whilst not being afraid to show leadership where necessary. Ministerial statements should follow a similar approach. While the UK is not in a position to dictate terms to countries abusing human rights and other international values, such statements are often of significant value to local activists working to defend their rights.

With the spectre of a no-deal Brexit removed, immediate concerns about existing EU funding for UK non-governmental organisations (NGOs) through 2020 have been alleviated.¹⁰ However, it remains unclear how and in what form the £1.5 billion in Official Development Assistance (ODA) that is currently dispensed through EU mechanisms will be repatriated. As has been argued by a number of authors, not least Baroness Anelay and Theo Clarke MP, our development expertise and aid budget remain major global assets in building a values-based foreign policy. The government's integrated review should be an opportunity for development expertise to have influence across our foreign policy, creating policy coherence for development, and therefore maintain a values-based and long-term strategic vision for our foreign policy that helps create a more peaceful, prosperous, and equitable world for all. Proposals to subsume the Department for International Development (DFID) under the auspices of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) should be shelved, and the government should ensure that aid spending across all departments retains a strong poverty focus – in line with the International Development Act. At an operational level, DFID could explicitly consider the impact of development programming on economic inequality. This could, for instance, result in greater focus on supporting the public provision of health, high quality education and social protection.

The UK is an international centre of excellence for peacebuilding, with experienced NGOs and academic experts who have until recently received a significant proportion of their project funding through pooled EU grants. It will be important to ensure that as funding streams are repatriated to direct UK control this expertise is maintained and developed. This may mean reviewing and revising existing UK mechanisms for funding peacebuilding to ensure that they are agile and appropriate for civil society peacebuilding work. Similarly, existing support for the FCO's human rights and governance initiatives, both through embassies and through centrally coordinated schemes should be built upon and enhanced, rather than risk marginalisation behind economic and trade priorities. Wherever possible such mechanisms should be flexible enough to support smaller and specialist NGOs and experts, rather than being more accessible to large consultancies as can be the case.

As the Foreign Secretary has already announced, one way to show leadership on human rights issues would be to increase the use of 'Magnitsky' sanctions against human rights abusers who have some financial connections to the UK. The use of these and other financial instruments, such as Unexplained Wealth Orders, are to be warmly welcomed but it is important to ensure they are being used consistently based on the level of wrongdoing rather than the strategic alignment of their country of

⁸ See for example the ideas set out in: Adam Hug, *Institutionally blind? International organisations and human rights abuses in the former Soviet Union*, The Foreign Policy Centre, February 2016, <https://fpc.org.uk/publications/institutionallyblind/>; and Adam Hug, *Institutionally Blind: The next steps in reforming the Council of Europe and the OSCE*, The Foreign Policy Centre, November 2017, <https://fpc.org.uk/institutionally-blind-next-steps-reforming-council-europe-osce/>

⁹ David Maddox, *Attorney General vows to change Human Rights Act and limit power of Supreme Court judges*, *Daily Express*, February 2020, <https://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/1242879/attorney-general-suella-braverman-human-rights-act-supreme-court-judges-cabinet-reshuffle>

¹⁰ DFID, *EU-funded programmes under the withdrawal agreement*, January 2020, <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/eu-funded-programmes-under-the-withdrawal-agreement>

origin.¹¹ To assist with this process, it will be vital to ensure the full implementation of the Registration of Overseas Entities Bill, as set out in the Queen's Speech, which will finally create the long-awaited beneficial ownership register for UK properties owned by offshore-entities, as well as the wider 2019–2022 Economic Crime Plan.¹²

As is made clear by the essays on trade from Ruth Bergen and Dr Emily Jones, as well as by Baroness Anelay, it is impossible to separate global political foreign policy from international economic issues. The promotion of an international rules-based order also requires the UK to lead in setting and enforcing fair global economic rules that work for everyone and that deliver positive outcomes in line with the SDGs as well as international commitments on climate change and human rights. Baroness Anelay's suggestion to include economic issues in the remit of the National Security Council is one part of a solution, but it also requires articulating solutions to global economic challenges that put the rights and needs of people at the centre. It will mean putting our own house in order as well as working to make the global economic rules as fair as possible. The ongoing OECD-BEPS discussions, including a minimum effective corporate tax rate, are one opportunity for the UK to engage positively to strengthen international governance. Meanwhile, the UK should ensure its own Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies continue to reform to achieve higher standards of tax transparency.¹³

The United Nations Climate Summit in Glasgow (COP26) represents a chance for real climate leadership from the UK Government and is the first big test of a values-based vision for 'Global Britain'. As Caroline Lucas MP argues, this will be dependent on investment in the hard work of diplomacy to raise the ambition of other nations' plans to reduce emissions, getting our own house in order at home, and a relentless focus on a just way forward for the countries and communities worst affected. Beyond the COP, policy coherence is key. As Caroline Lucas sets out clearly, the government cannot continue to finance fossil fuel projects overseas while claiming climate leadership. The UK's trade regime could be a powerful expression of its commitment to environmental and sustainability policy, as Ruth Bergen and Dr Emily Jones make clear. The government should review all trade provisions in its trade agreements to 'stress test' them against climate goals as well as human rights commitments, potentially using the suggested 'Global Britain' values process outlined above.

In a fast-changing world with new powers rising, old institutions struggling and future challenges emerging, having a clear approach to values in British foreign policy is not just about doing what we think is right but about ensuring we are actively helping to shape the international systems, norms and rules that the UK will have to work within for decades to come. The threats to the idea of liberal democracy from increasingly confident authoritarian states and internal strains and inequalities in established democracies are real, and need to be addressed to halt and reverse its decline. As a medium-sized power, albeit one with considerable assets, the UK will need to show it is still willing to work collaboratively with partners, and to use the tools of influence available to it to creatively and meaningfully shape the future direction of the international system and to respond effectively to specific crises and abuses of its values.

¹¹ Home Office, *Circular 003/2018: unexplained wealth orders*, February 2018, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/circular-0032018-criminal-finances-act-unexplained-wealth-orders/circular-0032018-unexplained-wealth-orders>

¹² Transparency International UK, *Measures to tackle dirty money in UK property market a major step in fight against corruption*, December 2019, <https://www.transparency.org.uk/press-releases/registration-of-overseas-entities-bill-queens-speech-2019/>; HM Treasury and Home Office, *Economic crime plan 2019 to 2022*, July 2019, <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/economic-crime-plan-2019-to-2022>

¹³ The OECD and G20 are working on a new Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) framework to address corporate tax avoidance. See <https://www.oecd.org/tax/beps/>

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this publication that values should be an important part of the foundations of future UK foreign policy, we would like to make a number of recommendations.

The UK Government should:

- Agree a clear 'Global Britain' values statement of the principles underpinning the UK's role in the world.
- Use the values statement to develop a 'Global Britain Benchmark' that assesses the impact of new policies against these principles.
- Demonstrate a renewed commitment to engage with and reform the regional and multilateral institutions the UK remains a part of, while building new partnerships for the future.
- Defend and maintain the spirit as well as the fact of its commitment to allocate 0.7 per cent Gross National Income (GNI) to international development assistance by:
 - Keeping a separate Department for International Development with a Secretary of State for International Development;
 - Ensuring aid spending across all departments retains a strong poverty focus – in line with the International Development Act; and by the
 - Coordination and sharing of best practice on aid spending, which would see other government departments meeting higher standards on aid transparency.
- Show that the UK still has the confidence and stature to stand up for its values by supporting those who defend them, and speaking out and taking action when they are abused, by:
 - Encouraging ambassadors and ministers to condemn human rights abuses wherever they occur;
 - Actively using and equitably applying new 'Magnitsky'-style personal sanctions;
 - Fully implementing new measures to improve financial transparency, and take further action on tax havens; and
 - Increasing and improving UK funding for peacebuilding and human rights.
- Remain actively committed to the promotion of human rights, defence and security in the European neighbourhood, of which the UK is still a part.
- Take decisive and immediate action to demonstrate climate leadership, including:
 - Announcing a high-ambition Nationally Defined Contribution (NDC) for COP26 and working with countries around the world to aim for increased ambition in their NDCs, in time to know how much is left to do to close the gap between current plans and the aim of limiting warming to 1.5°C;
 - Scaling up resources to impacted communities, including a new goal for climate finance for adaptation, and leading efforts to find new and additional sources of finance for loss and damage;
 - Immediately stopping all new support for fossil fuels (oil, coal and gas) and phasing out existing investments;
 - Implementing policies at home that demonstrably put us on track for net zero as soon as possible, without using international offsets, and recognising that – without the inclusion of consumption emissions – this is only part of the job.
- Ensure efforts to address international economic issues are joined up with global political foreign policy by:
 - Including economic issues within the remit of the National Security Council; and
 - Partaking fully in the OECD-BEPS discussions, including on a minimum effective corporate tax rate, as well as ensuring that the UK's own Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies continue to reform to meet higher standards of tax transparency.

PHOTO CREDITS

Cover: Lighthouse and sunset, Isle of Skye. Image by [Frank Winkler](#) from [Pixabay](#).

Page 12: Image by [S. Hermann & F. Richter](#) from [Pixabay](#)

Page 15: Image by [ItNeverEnds](#) from [Pixabay](#)

Page 19: Image by [Anfaenger](#) from [Pixabay](#)

Page 23: Image by [Alexander Kliem](#) from [Pixabay](#)

Page 29: Image by [ElasticComputeFarm](#) from [Pixabay](#)

Page 33: Activists gather in Westminster during the London climate strikes in September 2019. Photo credit: Eleanor Farmer/Oxfam.

Page 37: Workers at Oxfam's beehive production workshop in Bahir Dar, Ethiopia. Oxfam is helping to assist and train the local community in honey production, distribution and selling. Photo credit: Kieran Doherty/Oxfam.

Page 40: A woman tea plantation worker shows the breakdown of wages on her pay slip. The slip is impossible to understand for a majority of the workers; they do not know what comprises their salary or what is it that they actually get. Photo credit: Roanna Rahman/Oxfam.

Page 44: Women's March participants in Liverpool in January 2017. Photo credit: [Samwalton9](#).

Page 47: A participant at the UK Youth Parliament in November 2015. Photo credit: Roger Harris.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This collection of essays was edited by Adam Hug, Dr Abigael Baldoumas, Katy Chakraborty and Dr Danny Srisikandarajah. The editors would like to thank the authors who have kindly contributed to this collection and provided invaluable support in developing the project. In addition, the editors are very grateful for the advice and guidance of a number of different experts who assisted with the research. They would also like to thank the Parliamentarians, NGO leaders, officials and experts who attended a private roundtable in October 2019 whose insights have helped to develop the thinking behind this project. The publication would not have been possible without the editorial, research and administrative support provided by colleagues including: Poppy Ogier, Sam Nadel, Helen Bunting, Sarah Grainger, Melanie Kramers, Kiri Hanks and Oli Pearce. Special thanks to Ed Cairns, who was instrumental in the first draft of the discussion paper that led to this work.

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors of each essay alone and do not represent the views of The Foreign Policy Centre, Oxfam GB or the other essay contributors.

© Oxfam GB and The Foreign Policy Centre March 2020

For further information on the issues raised in this paper please email advocacy@oxfaminternational.org and info@fpc.org.uk

This publication is copyright but the text may be used free of charge for the purposes of advocacy, campaigning, education, and research, provided that the source is acknowledged in full. The copyright holder requests that all such use be registered with them for impact assessment purposes. For copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for translation or adaptation, permission must be secured and a fee may be charged. Email policyandpractice@oxfam.org.uk

The information in this publication is correct at the time of going to press.

Published by Oxfam GB and The Foreign Policy Centre under ISBN 978-1-78748-573-0 in March 2020. DOI: 10.21201/2020.5730
Oxfam GB, Oxfam House, John Smith Drive, Cowley, Oxford, OX4 2JY, UK
Foreign Policy Centre, 80-83 Long Lane, London, EC1A 9ET, UK

OXFAM

Oxfam is an international confederation of 20 organizations networked together in more than 90 countries, as part of a global movement for change, to build a future free from the injustice of poverty. Please write to any of the agencies for further information, or [visit www.oxfam.org](http://www.oxfam.org)

THE FOREIGN POLICY CENTRE

The Foreign Policy Centre (FPC) is an outward-looking, non-partisan international affairs think tank based in the United Kingdom (UK). Our mission is to provide an open and accessible space for the ideas, knowledge and experience of experts, academics and activists from across the world, so that their voices can be heard by a global audience of citizens and decision makers in order to find solutions to today's international challenges.

The FPC has a global perspective and a focus on Europe, the former Soviet Union, the Middle East and Asia. We also seek to examine what a progressive, pragmatic and internationalist foreign policy for the UK could be. A commitment to democracy, human rights, good governance and conflict resolution is at the heart of our work. Visit us at <https://fpc.org.uk/>



The
**Foreign Policy
Centre**

