People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University 8 Mai 1945 – Guelma
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of Letters and English Language

جامعة 8 ماي 1945ـقالمة
كلية الآداب واللغات
قسم الآداب واللغة الإنجليزية

Option: Civilization

The Seeds of the New Anglo -saxon Bond:

British American Relationship Under Tony Blair

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Partial Fulfilment of the

Requirements for the Master's Degree in Language and Culture

Board of Examiners

Chair: Prof. ELAGGOUNE Abdelhak   University of 8 Mai 1945/Guelma

Supervisor: Dr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid   University of 8 Mai 1945/Guelma

Examiner: Mr. ZEMMOURI Layachi   University of 8 Mai 1945/Guelma

Submitted by: Supervised by:

MARTANI Hadjer   Dr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid

MEKNASSI Kaouther

June 2024

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to all those who have contributed to the completion of this dissertation.

First, we would like to express our sincere gratitude and appreciation to our supervisor Dr. BOUDECHICHE Hamid, who has been an exceptional supervisor. He provided valuable help, constructive criticism, and encouragement throughout the dissertation writing process. Thank you for your professionalism your wisdom, patience, and unwavering support for our efforts.

We are also grateful to the examining committee members, Professor ELAGGOUNE Abdelhak and Mr. ZEMMOURI Layachi, for the time devoted to reading and evaluating this dissertation. We thank our university teachers for the knowledge they transmitted to us and the guidance they have shown all along our learning journey that helped us to achieve this position. We are grateful to our colleagues for their support and assistance in accomplishing this work.

Dedication 1

In the name of Allah, I dedicate this work to my closest soul, to my great hero in life, my dear father, the best person I have ever known, whose support and encouragement made it possible for me to do this work.

To my love; my mother who always supported me, who taught me about dreams and how to fulfill them, the symbol of sacrifice, this work is for you, the best mom ever.

To my only sister **"Marwa"**, the best thing in my life is you. To my dear brothers" **"Fakhro"** and **"Younes"**, for their encouragement and love. May Allah bless them all.

To my dear love, **"my husband"**, who has faith in me for the way I am, who has always supported me and helped me to fulfill my dreams.

To my beloved grandmother **"Fatima"**, whose departure broke my heart, may Allah be Merciful with her.

To my best and closest friend, my second sister, my helpful partner **"Kaouther"** thank you for your help, encouragement, and support, thank you for being a source of strength.

To all my family members, my friends for their kind words thank you.

"Love you All"

Martani Hadjer

Dedication 2

First and foremost, I would like to express my thanks and gratitude to Allah who provided me with strength and guidance throughout my journey in this dessertation.

I dedicate this work from the bottom of my heart to my parents, who have been a source of inspiration and strength, standing by my side all the time. Their kindness is immeasurable. I also want to thank my beloved brothers for their presence and encouragement throughout my academic journey, especially my sister **"Amel"**, who has been my greatest cheerleader and my constant source of support. She believed in me strongly and she was always by my side. Without forgetting my nephew my little prince **"Abdulrahman"**, who brought great joy to my life.

Last but not least, I dedicate this dissertation to my work partner my best friend and my companion on this path **"Hadjer"**, thank you for all the assistance you provided throughout our dissertation journey, l appreciate your support, you have been the best companion to me in this journey. I thank all members of my family.

I thank my dear friends for their kind words and support. To everyone who contributed, even with a small drop in this work thank you, your encouragement means a lot to me.

Meknassi Kaouther

Abstract

This research looks into the unique relationship between the United States and United Kingdom under the tenure of Tony Blair. Winston Churchill once referred to this close partnership as "Special Relationship". The ties between the two countries grew stronger and increased under Tony Blair's premiership. He was regarded as a close ally of the United States, notably during the administrations of Bill Clinton and George W. Bush. In essence, America saw Britain as its strongest ally despite any political changes in the UK and the US, therefore, maintaining a strong connection is crucial for both countries. The significance of this connection extends beyond their borders, as they play critical roles in maintaining the international order as prominent members of the UN Security Council and other international organizations. This research also examines the evolution and implications of the special bond between the UK and US, and highlights Tony Blair's role in shaping and strengthening the relations between the two countries especially in the aftermath of the Attacks of 9/11, and the opposition that he faced on the issue of supporting United States in international conflicts such as Kosovo and Afghanistan, and his cooperation with George Bush on the invasion of Iraq. The research concludes that the relationship between the two countries reached its apogee when it became politically very costly to Tony Blair.

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى البحث في العلاقة الفريدة من نوعها بين الولايات المتحدة والمملكة المتحدة في عهد توني بلير، وقد أشار ونستون تشرتشل إلى هذه الشراكات الوثيقة على أنها "علاقات خاصة". وقد توطدت هذه العلاقات وازدادت قوة في ظل رئاسة توني بلير، حيث كان يعتبر حليفًا وثيقًا للولايات المتحدة، ولا سيما خلال إدارتي بيل كلينتون وجورج بوش، كانت أمريكا ترى في بريطانيا أقوى حليف لها. وعلى الرغم من التغيرات السياسية في المملكة المتحدة والولايات المتحدة، فإن الحفاظ على علاقة قوية أمر بالغ الأهمية لكلا البلدين، وتمتد أهمية هذا الارتباط إلى ما وراء حدودهما، حيث يلعبان أدواراً حاسمة في الحفاظ على القواعد. وباعتبارهما عضوين بارزين في مجلس الأمن الدولي والمنظمات الدولية الأخرى، كما يبحث هذا البحث في تطور العلاقة الخاصة بين المملكة المتحدة والولايات المتحدة وآثارها، وتسلط الضوء على دور توني بلير في تشكيل وتعزيز العلاقات بين البلدين خاصة في أعقاب هجمات الحادي عشر من سبتمبر، والمعارضة التي واجهها في مسألة دعم الولايات المتحدة في النزاعات الدولية مثل كوسوفو وأفغانستان، وتعاونه مع جورج بوش في غزو العراق، يخلص هذا البحث إلى أن العلاقات بين الدولتين وصلت إلى ذروتها عندما أصبحت مكلفة سياسيا بالنسبة لتوني بلير.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Abbreviation	Interpretation
AEC	Atomic Energy Commission
EMU	Economic and Monetary Union
FCO	Foreign Commonwealth Office
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
MLF	Multilateral Force
MORI	Marked and Opinion Research International
MRBM	Medium Range Ballistic Missiles
NATO	The North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NEC	National Economic Council
NTA	New Translantic Agenda
OED	Oxford English Dictionary
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
US	United States
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

Table of Contents

Introduction

Winston Churchill once wrote, "Learn all you can from history, for how else can one even make a guess what is going to happen in the future . . . in history lie all the secrets of statecraft"(McCausland and Stuart). Churchill was correct, and his own idea is particularly important for the study of the British –American exceptional relationship. Correctly comprehended, the lessons of the past not only assist to keep the issues of the present in perspective but they also converge to one essential conclusion; a kind of a close and a strong relationship exists between the United States and Britain with truly deep roots.

During Tony Blair's tenure as the British prime minister, the relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States was characterized by close cooperation, particularly during the leadership of US President Bill Clinton and later with President George W. Bush. The two shared common views on issues such as international intervention, human rights, and economic policies. The Alliance was notably tested during the Iraq War in 2003 when Blair supported the US led invasion, facing domestic opposition. Overall, Blair's era saw a strong transatlantic partnership with both cooperative efforts and challenges. The Anglo-saxon bond, rooted in a shared heritage of law, traditions, and culture, has been a key element in the Special Relationship between the United States and Britain. This bond has influenced their collective identity and has been a driving force behind their enduring alliance.

The Special Relationship has been a cornerstone of their foreign policy and has withstood the test of time, remaining a significant factor in international affairs. Blair had a close personal relationship with US Presidents Bill Clinton. Their friendship set a positive tone for US and UK relations during the late 1990s. This relationship continued when George W. Bush became president in 2001. The events of September 11, 2001 dramatically shifted the global geopolitical landscape. Blair strongly supported the US in the subsequent War on Terror, emphasizing the importance of addressing global terrorism. Blair's support for the

Iraq War led to widespread protests and criticism in the UK. The decision to join the US in the invasion without explicit UN authorization created tensions within Blair's government and the Labor Party.

This dissertation attempts to provide an insight into the strong relationship between the "two countries". The significance of this relationship goes beyond their borders, as they hold pivotal roles in upholding the international order. As prominent members of the UN Security Council and other multinational institutions, their collaboration is crucial. Tony Blair's tenure as Prime Minister saw a strong emphasis on the "Special Relationship "between the United States and Britain. Blair believed in the shared and common aspirations between the two nations and worked to strengthen the alliance, he deployed tremendous efforts to maintain the relations between the two nations very close.

The study aims to explore the development and implications of the Special relationship between the United States and Britain during Tony Blair's tenure as the British prime minister and describing the special relationship between the two nations and the significant impact of Tony Blair in strengthening the relations between the two countries. The dissertation is a historical method which is employed to get a clear understanding of the Special Relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States and how the British American relationship evolved under Tony Blair with the ensuing impact on this relationship.

This study employs existing data from individuals who were involved in shaping British-American relations during Tony Blair's leadership. This concerns policy makers, diplomats, and experts in international relations. Similarly, document analysis examines official documents, speeches, and policy statements from Tony Blair's administration and key figures in the British and American governments during that period, the work attempts to compare the nature of British- American relations before and during Tony Blair's leadership, and assess changes in policies, diplomatic strategies, and areas of cooperation. This research

is conducted through historical method to describe the special relationship between the two nations and the significant impact of Tony Blair in strengthening the relations between the two countries.

The current study aims to find adequate answers for the following Questions: What is the "special relationship" between the United Kingdom and the United States? How did the British American relationships evolve under the leadership of Tony Blair? How does Tony Blair impact the British American relationships?

Several books, reports and articles dealt with the topic. The Seeds of the New Anglo-saxon Bond British American Relationship under Tony Blair. explores the special relationship between Britain and America how it shaped through history until the tenure of Tony Blair.

The book *US_UK Relations at Start of the 21st Century* edited by J. D. McCausland and D. T. Stuart, was published in 2006 by the US Army War College's Strategic Studies Institute. It looks at how the strategic partnership between the UK and the US has evolved and changed over the period of the early 21st century as they have negotiated the difficulties of international security. The essays in this book cover a variety of subjects, such as military cooperation, political alignment and the difficulties posed by rising geopolitical threats. By doing so, the collection provides insights into the lasting importance and possible futures of this transatlantic alliance.

John Smith article "Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain Bearing on the return of Negro slaves, 1783 -1828" published in the journal of Negro History in 1920 covers the years 1783-1828, describing how the British policy of providing freedom to enslaved persons who escaped to their borders during the war and afterward became a source of conflict. Smith describes several episodes and diplomatic initiatives, including the varying results of the United States' attempts to secure the return of these individuals. He explores the broader implications for Anglo-American relations while also highlighting

individual events and accords that had an impact on this problem. Furthermore, the paper provides insights into both nations' thoughts and practices toward slavery and freedom during this period, emphasizing the moral and legal difficulties of the discussions.

Judi Atkins article "A New Approach to Humanitarian Intervention? "The foundation and implications of Tony Blair's Foreign Policy are examined in " Doctrine of International Community" with a special emphasis on his formulation of a novel strategy for humanitarian intervention. The research analyses Blair's attempts to defend foreign involvement on moral and ethical grounds was published in the Journal of British Politics in July 2007.

This article explores the key concepts of Blair's Doctrine, with a strong emphasis on the need for the international community to take action when serious human rights violations occurs. Atkins explores how the events of the 1990's, such as the position and how it shows à move toward more International Affairs.

In "The Historic Legacy of Tony Blair", Vernon Bogdanor analyses Tony Blair's challenging and transformative period as British Prime Minister. The article, which was published in March 2007 issue of Current History, explores some of Blair's major acheivements, such as modernizing the Labor Party, carrying about big changes to the public government, and making important changes to the constitution. Bogdanor also talks about Blair's strong internationalism and his management of the economy, especially his controversial choice to back the United States in the Iraq War. The article provides an objective assessment of Blair's influence on achievements and his critics.

"Edward Said and Kosovo" by David Zarnett analyzes the war in Kosovo using the ideologies of Said, emphasizing imperialism and orientalism. Zarnett explores how Said's theories can be applied to understanding the political, social and cultural aspects of conflict. He examines how political groups and the Western media presented the situation, revealing explanation sand plans for foreign interventions in Kosovo. Drawing on critical perspectives

from the site, Zarnett aims to reveal the underlying power structures and biases that have influenced speech and behavior in Kosovo. This book chapter adds to the knowledge of how to apply theoretical frameworks - such as Edward Said's - to actual geopolitical events to better understand their origins and effects.

James Naughtie's 2004 ''*The Accidental American: Tony Blair and the Presidency*'' explores the relationship between US President George W. Bush and British Prime Minister Tony Blair. Naughtie examines how Blair, previously focused on British domestic affairs, became heavily involved in American international politics, especially after the events of 9/11. The book examines the personal and political relationship between Bush and Blair, as well as Blair's support for the Iraq war and adherence to American strategies. It draws attention to the ways in which Blair's choices have shaped both his legacy and Britain's position in the world.

The chapter entitled " putting the world to Rights: Tony Blair's Foreign Policy Mission" is a part of the book *The Blair's Effect 2001-5.* By Christopher Hill edited by Anthony Seldon and Dennis Kavanagh published in Cambridge University Press in 2005. which determines the key features of Blair's policy under his tenure as a prime minister from 1997 to 2007 especially in the years following the terrorist attacks of 9/11 was characterized by significant worldwide conflicts including the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Also, Hill discuuses Blair's vision since He was influenced by moralistic and interventional outlook focusing on establishing democracy and human rights over the world ,overall Hill provides insight into Blair's foreign policy showing the complexities and contradictions that arise from his efforts to negotiate the post 9/11 geopolitical sense while maintaining ethical component to British international operation.

Alan P. Dobson's book *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century: Of Friendship, Conflict, and the Rise and Decline of Superpowers*, published by Psychology

Press in 1995, it delves into the complex relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom throughout the twentieth century. The book appears at crucial events including World Wars, the Cold War, and periods of collaboration and conflict to give light on the causes driving the alliance between these two major countries. It surely examines the evolving dynamics of power, ideology, and diplomacy, offering significant insights into the difficulties of international affairs in the twentieth century.

The book entitled *Intelligence Cooperation and the War on Terror: Anglo-American Security Relations after 9/11* by Adam Svendson published in 2009, examines the dynamic of intelligence sharing between the United States and the United Kingdom in the context of the post-9/11 security landscape. The book looks into the complexities of intelligence collaboration, exploring how it emerged and what it means for the wider conflict on terror. It is expected to address troubles, outcomes, and conflicts surrounding this collaboration providing insights into the complexities of international security alliances in contemporary times.

The article "The US–UK Special Relationship: Taking the 21st-Century Temperature". Written by Jhon Dumbrell, explores the nature of US-UK cooperation and how this relationship remain Important particularly in military operations in the tenure of Tony Blair Dumbrell Provides a comprehensive explanation of the US-UK alliance's dynamics in the twenty-first century. The paper examines the historical context of the" Special Relationship". The paper examines the historical context of the special relationship' and its continuity and changes, focusing on the aftermath of the terrorist attacks and the Iraq War. Dumbrell argues that, while the partnership is still strong, it has faced problems due to shifting global politics, leadership modifications and the influence of several US and UK leaders on the relationship, with a focus on the Blair-Bush era and public opinion. He adds

that the alliance is not static and is shaped by political, social, and economic elements on both sides.

The dissertation includes three chapters. The first chapter entitled " Historical Overview of British American Relationships'', it focuses on how they first interacted during colonial times, leading up to what is known as the "special relationship." It covers the American Revolution and the agreements that followed, giving a thorough view of the dynamic connection between these influential nations. The chapter also looks at modern challenges, like how Brexit might affect British-American relations, showing how this vital partnership keeps evolving. Looking through history, we see why the relationship between Britain and America is so important on the world stage and how it continues to change over time.

The second chapter entitled "British American Relationships under Tony Blair'', it looks on how was the British-American Relationships. It covers a background on Tony Blair and his leadership. Moreover, it observes how the relations evolved during this period. The chapter also looks at what is known as "Blair Doctrine ". It also explores Blair's cooperation in Global Affairs with the United States. This chapter also discusses the impact of the 9/11 attacks on the special relationship. It also looks on Legacy of Blair and Bush Partnership, starting with a Historic Legacy of Tony Blair and following by The Partnership between Blair and Bush.

The Third chapter entitled "Tony Blair's Influence on British American Relationships'', it focuses basically on the significant impacts of Tony Blair in shaping the US and UK Relationship that appeared clearly in the attacks of 9/11, and the personal dynamics with US President that began in the late eighties also the great criticism and opposition that faced Blair under his supporting America in different political movement specifically in the Iraq War on order to overthrow the Saddam regime he also faced strong

opposition from his Labor Party and the wider British public that see this as threat of the stability of the country and   discussing the Assessment of Tony Blair Policies on British American Relationships after that, the Impact of the Iraq war on British American Relationship.

Chapter One

Historical Overview of British American Relationships

The bond between Britain and America goes back, spanning many centuries and evolving through major events that affected global diplomacy and alliances. This chapter looks at how they first interacted during colonial times, leading up to what is known as the "special relationship." It covers the American Revolution and the agreements that followed, thorough comprehensive view of the dynamic connection between these influential nations. Starting with the early settlements that brought Britain and America together, the researcher explores how a unique bond grew, based on shared values, strategic alliances, and economic ties .It delves into key historical events like the American Revolution, the Mutual Defense Agreement, and the Polaris Sales Agreement, showing how they strengthened diplomatic and military cooperation (Skinner and Mallet).

The chapter also looks at modern challenges, like how Brexit might affect British-American relations, showing how this vital partnership keeps evolving. Looking through history, we see why the relationship between Britain and America is so important on the world stage and how it continues to change over time.

1.1. Early Interaction Between Britain and America

In the 17th century, Britain and America had a significant relationship, especially with the founding of Jamestown in 1607. Jamestown was started by the London Company under a royal charter from King James I, though it faced challenges initially. Eventually, the colony succeeded by growing tobacco, which attracted settlers looking for better economic opportunities than what they had in England. As Jamestown grew, it ran into conflicts with Native American tribes, leading to wars like the Anglo-Powhatan conflicts. They also started using African slaves on plantations, which changed the colony's economy. Despite some success, disagreements within the London Company and financial troubles caused the Crown

to take control of Jamestown in 1624. This time in history shows how complicated early British-American interactions were, mixing economic goals, cultural exchange, and conflicts. These interactions played a big role in shaping US history and laying the groundwork for future colonial policies (Tomečková).

The establishment of the Virginia House of Burgesses in Jamestown represents a significant development in early British-American interactions during the 17th century. In 1619, this legislative body was established, breaking with traditional British administration that restricted suffrage to landowners and allowing participation in representative government for freemen, or non-indentured settlers. The colonists' developing sense of self-governance and commitment to democratic ideals was reflected in the establishment of the House of Burgesses. Furthermore, tensions between colonists and British officials were highlighted by challenges to colonial authority, such as the issue surrounding Governor Samuel Argall. This highlighted early examples of colonial resistance and assertion of local control. These events shaped the course of British-American relations in the years preceding the American Revolution by adding to the colonial identity and paving the way for more significant changes in colonial policies (qtd. in Mix).

The United States and the United Kingdom have an economic connection that is characterized by a shared commitment to the "Anglo-Saxon economic model," emphasizing competition, wealth creation, and limited government involvement. This model features public shareholding, a strong financial sector, and reliance on stock and bond markets for investment. Policies implemented by Margaret Thatcher and continued by Tony Blair significantly shaped the UK's economy. However, the UK's economic independence is tempered by EU membership, subjecting it to EU regulations except in the case of the single currency and Economic and Monetary Union (EMU) of the EU, of which the UK chose to withdraw. Therefore, US engagement with the UK is within the broader EU regulatory

framework, highlighting the complex nature of transatlantic economic interactions involving the US, the UK, and the EU (McCausland and Stuart). It is clear that deeper transatlantic relations have been shaped by historical and cultural links, which have shaped not only economic policies but also societal and institutional frameworks on both sides of the Atlantic. The transmission of British culture to the American colonies is evident in the profound impact of British settlers on shaping colonial American society. Historical analysis underscores how British norms, values, language, and religious practices were transplanted to the colonies, contributing to the development of early American identity and societal structures. This cultural transfer represents a fundamental aspect of colonial history, reflecting the enduring legacy of British influence in shaping the fabric of American culture and society (Fischer).

1.2. History of Special Relationships

Winston Churchill originally described the "special relationship" that existed between the UK and the US in a 1946 speech delivered in Fulton, Missouri. According to Wallace and Phillips, they defined it as a connection based on common ideals, shared leadership, shared history, and a shared dedication to a liberal international order (263). In fact, a lot of scholars and observers identify the main factor fostering the distinctive connection as the shared Anglo-Saxon heritage and language (Marsh and Baylis 173). The United States maintained few foreign relationships and involvement in global affairs prior to World Wars I and II since it was primarily an isolationist nation. When the United States started to look outside of itself as events demanded, Churchill's idea of the unique relationship based on shared history and ideals along with constant overtures to then the United Kingdom became an obvious ally of US President Franklin D. Roosevelt (Sharp and Weisdorf). The United States was able to gain legitimacy and still does by being publicly backed by a foreign ally, even in spite of its propensity for acting independently (Conley).

After the United States War of Independence, relationships between the two countries were, at best, tepid in the 19th century. The US wanted to expand its frontiers, therefore it was at odds with the British in the Canadian Territories. Following the War of 1812, which was the climax of these tensions, the United States largely made an effort to stay out of military conflicts with the British. The American Civil War ignited a few more conflicts. Having recently declared their independence, the Confederate States of America sent envoys to Great Britain. The mere act of accepting these diplomats led to a temporary split between the two countries, though it is unclear how close the UK was to formally recognizing the Confederacy or endorsing its cause. As the 19th century came to a conclusion and World War I broke out, Europe saw high levels of tension during what became known as "The Great Rapprochement". The United States and the United Kingdom's relations warmed during this time due in part to the public's improving mood and the attitudes of politicians in both states. Regular trade and a revived sense of kinship between the two countries followed. Even while it wasn't the friendship we have today, this set the stage for the increasingly deeper bonds that developed during and after World War II (Conley).

1.3. The American Revolution and its Impact on the Relationship

The English-speaking population across the Atlantic expanded to the point where, by 1763, their objectives and interests diverged from those of the ruling class in the home nation, which is why the American Revolution occurred. Statesmen from Britain were unable to comprehend or adapt to the circumstances. Ironically, the British victory in the Seven Years War freed up more freedom for the secessionist forces to operate and eliminated the colonies' need for British security against a French threat at their borders. The British government's action in 763 to strengthen the imperial control structure and force the colonies to contribute to imperial defense makes sense. It proposed placing 400,000 soldiers at the borders of the United States and charging the Americans a share of the expenses(Ramsay 293).

This imperial defense plan stoked the long-running controversy over Parliament's taxing authority, which had its origins in the Stamp and Sugar Acts and reached a head in December 1773 when some Bostonians illegally dumped British tea cargo into the city harbor in protest at the newest instance of British taxation. During this four-year struggle, a number of British ministries failed to carry out the two main things that the colonial authorities had said they wished to achieve since at least 776: either sensible or forceful enforcement of British legislation, or the creation of a more workable form of imperial union. The king and his ministers blindly forced a set of regulations called as the Intolerable Acts through Parliament in response to the Boston Tea Party. The colonists asserted that these actions which also included closing the port of Boston and putting Massachusetts under the military administration of Maj. Gen. Sir Thomas Gage violated their rights to certain other interests and privileges (Ramsay 293).

Since they argued in 1763 that taxes on Americans could only be imposed by their own popular assemblies, not the British Parliament, the colonial leaders had suggested that an arbitrary British government should levy taxes in America to fund red-coated Regulars who could be employed to repress. Since then, they have prioritized protecting American liberties over border security. When Massachusetts came under military rule, it became more real and led to an armed insurrection. Because they had certain advantages, the Americans battled with good decision-making regarding protection. On the other side, the British were forced to transport supplies and troops thousands of miles across the Atlantic Ocean in order to conclude the war in a far-off place. Because of his courage, morality, and judgment, their leader, George Washington, was unquestionably their greatest asset; without Washington, the outcome of the war might have been different (Ramsay 293).

The prospect of French aid from overseas, high position in the world community, guarded soldiers in place of investigators or activists, and independence would unite the

various regions of the colonies and declare freedom from kingly dominance for all. Disagreements among the colonies may arise from supporters in England who supported the colonists' demands for Parliamentary demonstrations but not for independence. If the Revolution failed, its leaders could face trial and execution as traitors. Colonies ill-prepared for war faced the mightiest military force on the planet. They cannot produce their own weaponry, thus they must depend on England to provide the supplies needed to fight. The likelihood of winning the battle was minimal. The world's largest acknowledged empire would be cut off from the colonists (Ramsay 293).

1.4. Mutual Defense Agreement and Alliance

The purpose of the 1958 Mutual Defense Agreement, also known as the Agreement for Cooperation in the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes, was to allow the United States and the United Kingdom to share classified nuclear information related to their respective nuclear weapons programs as well as scientific knowledge and nuclear technology. ("Mutual Defense Agreement" qtd. in Mills Skinner,). The United States Atomic Energy Act 1946, often known as the McMahon Act, prohibited the US from exchanging nuclear energy knowledge with other states. As a result, the US and the UK were unable to collaborate on nuclear weapons following World War II. After that, the UK continued working on its own nuclear weapons program (Mills).

The McMahon Act was modified in 1954 to provide limited information sharing on defense-related topics and to permit information sharing on civil aspects of atomic energy. Parallel military and civil accords between the US and the UK were struck in 1955. While the military agreement allowed for a broader discussion on intelligence matters and planning, the civil agreement allowed for the provision of uranium 235 for civil uses. In order to allow for greater military cooperation with US allies, especially those who had made "substantial

progress" toward the creation of nuclear weapons, the McMahon Act was altered again in 1958. The UK was recognized as the only state that complied with the conditions (Mills).

The UK was taken into consideration when the Eisenhower administration tried to modify the McMahon Act. Not long after Eisenhower and Macmillan issued their "declaration of interdependence" in October 1957, the necessary legislation was brought before Congress. Three days after the McMahon Act's changes were passed, on July 3, 1958, the parties signed the MDA, which had been negotiated concurrently with US law. When the MDA was first established, it permitted the exchange of classified data about defense planning, atomic weapon defense training, assessing possible adversaries' atomic capabilities, developing delivery systems, and researching, developing, and designing military nuclear reactors. Additionally, it approved the ten-year sale of one fully operational nuclear submarine propulsion plant to the United Kingdom, together with the uranium required to power it.

Nonetheless, it prohibited the transfer of atomic weapons. Beginning in the early 1960s, the UK was also able to exchange data and carry out cooperative nuclear tests at US facilities because to technical cooperation agreements made under the MDA. The MDA has been the cornerstone of the UK-US nuclear alliance for almost 60 years, together with the Polaris Sales Agreement, under which the US gave the UK the Polaris and then the Trident nuclear missile system. In fact, the deal is "fundamental" to the UK's ability to maintain its independent nuclear deterrent, according to the Atomic Weapons Establishment, which oversees all facets of the country's nuclear weapons development. Since the MDA is not time-limited in its entirety, it will remain in effect until both parties decide to end it. It has, however, undergone numerous revisions during the course of its existence (Mills).

1.4.1. The Atomic Energy Act of 1946

One important piece of legislation that paved the way for the US to develop and regulate atomic energy was the McMahon Act of 1946, also called the Atomic Energy Act

(Rossouw). The Act recognizes the usefulness of atomic energy and the revolutionary potential of nuclear chain reactions in its opening policy statement. It draws attention to the double nature of atomic energy: its unclear consequences for civilian life and its potential for military application, as evidenced by the atomic bomb. The Act emphasizes the necessity of ongoing legal reform because the effects of atomic energy on society are unknown (as cited in Atomic Energy Act of 1946).

The Atomic Energy Act of 1946 cannot be implemented without the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), the regulatory body tasked with overseeing atomic energy activities. The five-member AEC, which is chaired by a chosen individual, is empowered to conduct scientific research, regulate the dissemination of technical data, and manage federal initiatives related to the production and application of atomic energy. The Act outlines broad research programs intended to advance both scientific understanding and technological applications of atomic energy. Among possibilities include establishing federal funding for research, promoting private R&D, controlling the flow of scientific and technical knowledge, and establishing government control over the production and use of fissionable materials. The Act gives the common defense and security top priority while advancing economic growth, public welfare, and international collaboration in the peaceful use of atomic energy.

The 1946 Atomic Energy Act reflects the geopolitical and technological advancements of the post-World War II era. By emphasizing international cooperation to halt the spread of nuclear weapons and civilian control over atomic energy, it represents a paradigm shift in nuclear governance. The Act had an impact on US nuclear policy throughout the Cold War and, with its organizational structure and guiding principles, laid the groundwork for subsequently adopted nuclear regulatory frameworks. In conclusion, the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 established a comprehensive regulatory framework that governs

the use and development of atomic energy in the United States. Its research programs, organizational structure, and policy statement all take into consideration the complex interplay of security, scientific, and political considerations that accompany managing atomic energy. The Act's long-lasting effects are still seen in nuclear policy and governance, emphasizing the need to combine international cooperation in nuclear matters with the requirements of social welfare and national security (qtd. in the 1946 Atomic Energy Act).

1.4.2. Polaris Sales Agreement

The United States' willingness to sell Polaris missiles to its European allies in the early 1960s served as an inspiration for the U.S.-U.K. Polaris collaboration. With these Medium-Range Ballistic Missiles (MRBM), NATO would have a weapon to stave off nuclear blackmail from the Soviet Union. August of the same year saw the proposal of a more extensive strategy by Robert Bowie, the former head of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department. He suggested creating a NATO Multilateral Force (MLF) comprised of Polaris-armed submarines with mixed, multinational crews. This strategy was also a failure. However, it was incorporated into a U.S. commitment to NATO for five Polaris submarines by newly elected President John F. Kennedy in May 1961. The concept of mixed manning was revolutionary to traditional military thought across the board, particularly when it came to its application to nuclear-powered submarines, where close, harmonious human relationships and prompt, appropriate action are critical (Bowie 1-3).

The notion faced a significant obstacle in the United States due to the presence of Rear Admiral Hyman G. Rickover. When the submarine MLF was abandoned in 1962, plans were made to replace it with a surface ship. Under NATO leadership, the surface Mobile Fleet (MF) would augment the national deterrent forces of the United States and the United Kingdom by randomly patrolling the high seas within reach of possible targets. The missiles and sophisticated subsystems would be provided by the US, while the ships would be

constructed in Europe. By this point, Britain had started its own, more modest effort, while the Soviet Union and the United States were both well into major projects to deliver nuclear bombs. Still, there were issues with the British scheme (Nelson). In 1957, the British government made the decision to create and preserve a potent nuclear deterrent.

In order to accomplish this, it developed the Blue Steel airborne missile, which was intended to equip the Vulcan, Victor, and Valiant bombers for deterrence. Due to the missile's shortcomings, Blue Streak, a surface-to-surface ballistic missile, and an appropriate nuclear warhead were developed. However, Britain gave up on Blue Streak in 1960 in favor of the American Skybolt missile due to the realities of development and deployment costs, an unsuitable geographic location, and related political and psychological factors. This was supposed to be a 1,000-mile-range nuclear-armed missile. It would be launched at a standoff distance from ground targets by fast bombers.The United States obtained the right to base American submarines at Holy Loch, Scotland, in exchange for Skybolt. The United States granted the British permission to buy Polaris missiles for its submarines if they so desired. Despite spending $500 million on Skybolt, the United States had only experienced an increasing number of test failures by the fall of 1962. Skybolt's days were plainly counted. In exchange for the Skybolt program, the United States secured the right to base American submarines at Holy Loch, Scotland, and offered the British government the option to purchase Polaris missiles for its submarines. Despite significant investment in Skybolt amounting to $500 million, ongoing test failures by the fall of 1962 signaled the program's impending demise, highlighting the diminishing viability of Skybolt within the U.S. defense strategy (Bowie 1-3).

1.5. Diplomatic Ties between Britain and the United States

Great Britain's capture of a significant number of African Americans during the Revolutionary conflict necessitated considerable efforts to secure their return. This issue was

pivotal in the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Paris in 1783, which formally ended the conflict. Despite repeated violations of the treaty's prohibitions against the removal of African Americans, several diplomatic missions were dispatched to Great Britain in attempts to resolve the matter. However, these negotiations were largely unsuccessful until the conclusion of the Jay Treaty in 1794 (Smith 275, Lindsay).

Great Britain's reluctance to comply with the return of fugitive African Americans can be traced back to its humanitarian philosophy, exemplified by Lord Mansfield's landmark ruling in the 1772 Somerset case, which declared that entering British territory conferred freedom upon individuals. Throughout the Revolutionary War, British military authorities upheld this philosophy, extending freedom to African Americans even beyond British-controlled territories. Several British commanders, including Lord Dunmore in Virginia, as well as directives from Clinton and Cornwallis, granted freedom to enslaved African Americans who enlisted in British forces. While motivations behind these actions varied, collectively they reflected African Americans' perception of themselves as free individuals during the war (Smith 275).

Consequently, many African Americans sought refuge within British lines, forming regiments and joining the armed forces. The withdrawal of British forces from certain territories resulted in the transportation of thousands of African Americans, causing significant economic disruption and instability in the Southern states, particularly South Carolina and Georgia. This exodus jeopardized the economic foundations of the South. General Washington, responding to these challenges, reversed his stance on enlisting African Americans into the American Army and took decisive action against British attempts to retain them. The unresolved position of African Americans hampered lengthy and ultimately futile negotiations between military representatives of the United States and Great Britain. Henry Laurens was instrumental in pushing for the inclusion of measures pertaining to abducted

African Americans in the Treaty of Paris through urgent meetings spearheaded by Benjamin Franklin and others. Thanks largely to Laurens's influence, the treaty addressed the issue of African Americans abducted during the war (Smith 275).

The foundation of the 1783 Treaty of Paris, which put an official end to the Revolutionary War, required British forces to leave the United States without robbing or damaging property belonging to Americans. But as General Washington's meeting with Sir Guy Carleton in May 1783 makes clear, Great Britain did not follow through on this arrangement. Washington expressed surprise and disapproval upon learning that African Americans were still being embarked upon, viewing this as a violation of both the letter and spirit of the treaty. Delegates from Virginia proposed filing a formal complaint and seeking compensation from Britain for these transgressions (Smith 275).

Numerous incidents of non-compliance persisted even after Carleton issued subsequent instructions to halt property seizures, including those involving African Americans. Washington himself acknowledged the likelihood that British forces had transported some of his and his acquaintances' slaves to New York. Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson highlighted Britain's prioritization of promises of freedom made to African Americans over treaty obligations when seeking guidance from France on addressing British violations. As tensions between the United States and Britain escalated, Washington expressed skepticism about compensating owners due to the challenges of accurately identifying and valuing enslaved individuals. He criticized Carleton for deviating from the treaty's intent and purpose.

Carleton, in turn, justified compensation as a means to protect property and shield owners from losses, proposing the appointment of commissioners to oversee property embarkations in accordance with the treaty's Seventh Article and negotiate compensation arrangements. Congress endorsed this proposal and appointed commissioners to manage these

affairs as directed by Washington. In summary, the strained diplomatic circumstances surrounding the 1783 Treaty of Paris underscored the challenges and complexities in early British-American diplomatic relations. Great Britain's disregard for treaty clauses pertaining to property, including African Americans, strained relations and triggered diplomatic efforts to seek compensation and reparations. These early diplomatic challenges highlighted broader concerns about trust and compliance with international agreements. Despite these challenges, later diplomatic encounters prepared the way for the growth of connections between the United States and Britain, initiating a sophisticated and long-lasting diplomatic alliance that still has an impact on world affairs today (Smith 275).

1.6. Trade between Britain and America

One of the US's principal trading and economic allies is the UK. Because of the size, significance, and political and economic ramifications of U.S.-UK trade and investment relations, Congress is interested in these relationships. The 118th Congress's members may consider pursuing executive trade initiatives and maybe negotiating bilateral free trade agreements (FTAs) as means of enhancing investment and economic ties between the United States and the United Kingdom. Additionally, they may assess US-UK measures aimed at resolving specific bilateral trade challenges as well as shared global trade concerns. Something changed in the 1770s, possibly in tandem with Britain's industrialization, population expansion, and move toward being a net importer of wheat. According to Jones, there were bad crops in 1771 and 1772, and the response from American supplies was as expected. Regardless, harvests are noted as "fine" in 1773, "plentiful" in 1775, and "unremarkable but not bad" in 1774; yet, it is during these years that large-scale imports from America began. After this point, imports still fluctuate significantly, but the relationship between imports and shortage is no longer as evident as it was during the previous time (Mix).

A report of an 1821 Parliamentary Select Committee (BPP) states that it is probably no coincidence that when the Corn Law of 1774 was passed, a period of "practically free" grain commerce began with the arrival of large supplies of American grain in British ports. Only small import duties were required due to the price increases caused by the French and Napoleonic Wars; nonetheless, beginning in 1791, the Corn Laws became increasingly protectionist (Sharp 12). Therefore, it does not seem that trade policy is the main reason behind the notable variations in US imports that we have seen during this period. Furthermore, the UK's meager harvest cannot account for them. There was a sharp decline in American imports after 1775, albeit this may be explained fairly simply. First, there is no doubt that the nation's output of wheat and flour was impacted by the American War of Independence, which ranged from 1775 to 1783. There were three phases to the war's consequences, according to Hunter; the first saw a rise in demand that lasted until 1777.

Following that, there was unrest until 1779 as a result of the British invasion of the Philadelphia region in 1777.To impede the British from procuring flour, for example, General George Washington commanded the destruction of millstones, and the British also launched attacks on merchant mills. Additionally, beginning in 1776, the British attempted to impose a blockade on occasion. Congress also imposed an embargo in 1778 that forbade the export of grain and wheat but allowed some illegal exports. With the restoration of international trade and bountiful harvests, the final phase, or the period of recuperation, got underway in 1780.

A complete ban on American wheat imports resulted from the planned shipment of large quantities of wheat from Philadelphia to England in 1788, despite the lack of specific data on wheat imports from America between 1787 and 1791. This was due to political animosity towards the newly independent United States and fears of introducing the Hessian fly to England. This ban, justified in a parliamentary pamphlet citing the insect threat, coincided with British harvest failures in 1788-1789, underscoring Britain's reliance on

imported wheat. The ban was reversed in 1790, with British leaders recognizing America's importance as a food reserve and prioritizing economic stability over perceived risks posed by the Hessian fly or political factors such as the French Revolution. Since its inception, wheat has been endowed with a unique position; Revolutionaries saw it as the "perfect republican crop," whereas tobacco was linked to "royal government, debt, slavery, and subpar agricultural practices." (Matson 246). Hunter notes that "wheat and flour together served as a cornerstone of America's newly independent transatlantic commerce". It is possible that the Hessian Fly itself encouraged agricultural innovation, as through diversification experiments, which contributed to the long-term prosperity of wheat production in the United States (Matson 246). Similar claims are made by Hunter, who argues that the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars promoted the employment of innovative milling techniques, which in turn helped America succeed in exporting wheat and flour later on.

The period from 1792 onwards was marked by war, which had significant implications for trade between the United States and Britain. Despite a general upward trend in imports from the United States during this time, interruptions occurred due to events such as the arrival of the Hessian fly in Delaware and Maryland in 1792, leading to a sharp decline in wheat exports from America until the early 19th century. The recovery of American wheat exports was notable following poor harvests in Europe in 1799, with Parliament enacting measures to encourage imports of American wheat by 1801. However, during the Napoleonic Wars, trade between Britain and the United States faced difficulties, with variations in trade quantities impacted by factors like Napoleon's Continental System and the subsequent American trade embargo in 1807.

While illegal exports persisted, commerce with Britain decreased as a result of the American embargo, and Napoleon's acknowledgement of America as a major grain supplier further changed the nature of trade. Trade levels decreased throughout the embargo years and

the Non-Intercourse Act of 1809 that followed. American agricultural resources were increasingly seen as essential for satisfying Britain's food demands, regardless of the tensions that existed between the U.S. and the UK. Early 19th-century parliamentary reports and discussions stressing America's role in exporting wheat and flour to Britain during times of scarcity and high costs show that attitudes had changed to view the country as the "granary of Europe.". British millers observed that American flour was of excellent quality and was convenient to transport; yet, these imports also presented difficulties for local millers, prompting grievances and parliamentary investigations over the effects of American flour imports on the British milling sector (Hunter 505).

Because of the protectionist position contained in the Corn Laws, American imports to Britain declined after 1818, and parliamentary reports indicated a discernible reduction in interest in American supplies. Despite the massive amount of parliamentary material released throughout the discussions leading up to the abolition of the Corn Laws, imports continued to drop. Prominent studies such as William Jacob's thorough investigation of European agriculture and corn in 1827 left out America, indicating waning interest in the American grain supply. Throughout the 1833 parliamentary sessions, this trend continued and the significance of the American supply was downplayed. A revival of trade with America was made possible by the removal of import customs and the sliding scale in 1849, which resulted in a massive increase in imports known as the "Grain Invasion." This era's historical insights highlight the importance of the American grain supply, which dates back to the seventeenth century. For example, in 1791, appeals from British merchants and areas unable to produce enough grain on their own highlighted the reliance on American imports for food.With the growing recognition of American agriculture's potential to meet Britain's food needs, the British Board of Agriculture declared in 1800 that America was, or would become, the "granary of Europe." This historical perspective makes one wonder how groups such as the

Anti-Corn Law League might have come into being in the late 1700s if it weren't for crop failures and disruptions caused by war, which could have sped up the pace of globalization (Hunter 505).

1.7. Brexit and its Implications on British American Relations

When Peter Wilding coined the term "BREXIT" in 2012, it quickly gained popularity, especially on social media, both in the UK and anywhere else. BREXIT, a portmanteau of "Britain exiting the EU," is the result of combining the phrases British and departure. The term "Grexit" actually came into being in 2010 and was influenced by Greece's decision to leave the European Union (Fontaine). The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) has introduced the term "Brexit", highlighting its "impressive" rate of widespread usage. Lexicographers claimed the word filled a need in the language, but it is currently used widely to characterize the occurrence and can be found in numerous newspapers published in other languages. Grexit, a term used to describe "the (potential) withdrawal of Greece from the monetary union of the Eurozone," was also included. During his 2013 speech, David Cameron declared that if his government wins the general election in 2015, he would call for a referendum on the EU's ongoing membership (Foroozanfar and Ali 14).

During the Cold War, America took the initiative to reinforce European security against the Soviet menace. As progress in US-EU relations, the US and EU negotiated the "New Transatlantic Agenda" (NTA) as part of their revitalized and improved security cooperation plan after it ended (Rees). In the transatlantic relationship, Britain was crucial in preserving stability and addressing the perspectives and interests of the US and EU as a major member of the EU and a close ally of the former. Obama highlighted the close cooperation between the UK and the US on important international issues during a speech given in Germany. He emphasized how beneficial the UK's power and leadership inside the EU are, stressing that their influence benefits not only Europe but the entire world. Obama stated that

he firmly believes that the UK should stay in the EU and that doing so will help to advance beneficial outcomes on a global scale. Furthermore, as the US's closest friend with views in common, the UK was essential to the US's involvement in the EU since it represented US viewpoints within the European Union. According to American professor Stephanie Hofmann, "the British government was crucial in maintaining these relations." It served as a middleman, facilitating negotiations between the two organizations to find solutions (Para 2). Professor Hofmann reaffirmed the UK's position as an integrator and intermediary in security and military matters within the EU and NATO (Foroozanfar and Ali 14).

The role of Britain in transatlantic security policies, particularly demonstrated in the Iranian nuclear deal negotiations, showcases the UK's significant position as a strong negotiator within the European framework. Despite not having extensive economic ties with Tehran, the UK played a leading role in these talks, representing the American perspective in transatlantic concerns. However, with Brexit drawing near, questions are raised about the UK's ability to continue acting as a go-between for the US, NATO, and the EU in the future. Professor Hofmann highlights how Brexit could erode the UK's transatlantic influence, potentially leaving a void in international security cooperation, which would impact US interests and global affairs (Rees). Following Brexit, the UK is expected to shift its focus inward, concentrating on domestic affairs and renegotiating its international relationships. This change in priorities could reduce the UK's capacity to align with American interests and support US decisions on global issues. While opinions on Brexit vary among American leaders, such as Trump's endorsement based on nationalist sentiments and economic opportunities, former President Obama advocated for UK's EU membership to enhance its global influence (Levin). The differing perspectives within US politics highlight the uncertainty surrounding Brexit's implications for transatlantic relations, but they underscore a

shared concern about potential disruptions to Anglo-American interests and cooperation due to this significant geopolitical shift (Galantin 98).

To sum up, this chapter provides a comprehensive historical overview of British-American relationships, tracing their evolution from early interactions through pivotal events like the American Revolution and diplomatic alliances such as the Mutual Defense Agreement and Polaris Sales Agreement. It highlights the enduring nature of this partnership, rooted in shared values and strategic interests, with a focus on defense, security, and trade. The chapter also addresses contemporary challenges posed by Brexit, which may reshape diplomatic, economic, and security engagements between the two nations. Overall, the historical narrative underscores the resilience and adaptability of British-American relations, characterized by mutual interests and ongoing collaboration on the global stage.

Endnotes

---

[1]Brexit: is a combination of the words "Britain" and "exit". This has to do with the UK's decision to leave the European Union (EU). In June 2016, a countrywide vote known as the Referendum resulted in that decision.

[2]Grexit: is the term used to describe a chance for Greece to leave the eurozone, the group of European Union members that use the euro as their currency. Although the fact that Greece did not officially leave the eurozone, the term "Grexit" was frequently used to discuss the potential consequences and challenges of such an action.

[3]McMahon Act: Known as the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, it was passed by the United States after World War II to regulate the use and transfer of nuclear energy and weapons. It banned the sharing of nuclear technology with countries, even allies, and imposed strict regulations on nuclear materials. This act established the nuclear policy and security procedures of the United States.

[4]The Great Rapprochement: There was a period in the late 1800s and early 1900s when the United States and Great Britain began to move toward closer and warmer relations. Their relationship was often strained in the past, but during this period they began to cooperate more on political and economic issues. Their stronger union today was made possible by their better friendship.

Chapter Two

British American Relationships under Tony Blair

The relationship between Britain and America developed especially during Tony Blair's tenure as Prime Minister, and became even stronger, because of Blair's influence. This chapter explores the British-American relationships. It covers a background on Tony Blair and his leadership in the early years, in addition to the limits of his policies. The chapter also looks at what is known as "Blair Doctrine".

The Blair Doctrine was put during the Kosovo war 1999, where Blair played a Pivotal role in rallying NATO forces, the doctrine was based on three principles are humanitarian intervention, Britain as Pivotal Power and Britain as A Bridge. The research also explores Blair's cooperation in Global Affairs with the United States which is exemplified by the Kosovo War and Afghanistan Conflict. After the attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, relations between Great Britain and the United States strengthened and Great Britain became a bridge between Europe and America. Tony Blair doctrine of international humanitarian interventionism, his attempt to revive Britain's role as a superpower and a leading European country, and his belief that the UK can serve as a bridge between the United States and Europe shaped the special relationship during that period. This chapter also discusses the impact of the 9/11 attacks on the special relationship. The chapter also looks on Legacy of Blair and Bush Partnership, starting with a Historic Legacy of Tony Blair and following by The Partnership between Blair and Bush. Tony Blair period as a Prime Minister was a transformative period for British-American relationships.

2.1 Tony Blair Background

Labor Prime Minister, Tony Blair, pilot of the Northern Ireland peace process was born in Scotland on May 6, 1953 in Edinburgh studied law at Oxford University to become a lawyer. He joined the Labor Party in 1975 and successfully campaigned for Sedge field

asylum in 1983. Before Tony Blair was appointed Shadow Home Secretary in 1992, he held a number of Shadow Cabinet posts. His association with Gordon Brown was completely changed in 1994 when Labor leader John Smith died unexpectedly. After the agreement with Gordon Brown, Tony Blair won the next leadership campaign. Should Labor win the next election, Blair would assume an important role as chancellor. Tony Blair was seen as a new kind of charismatic politician, perhaps the best opposition leader of the time, and he even managed to change Labor's "Clause IV"; In simple terms, it was a request for Nationalization, or" Common Ownership" as it called; For an extended period of time, Theorem IV was highly contentious. Hugh Gaitskell, the Labor Leader at the time, blamed the party's failure in the 1959 general election. However, the left of the party strongly rejected his attempts to change Clause IV. In reality, the party's decision to maintain that part and put it on membership cards actually made his defeat worst (The Week Staff).

When the Labor Party gained the general election in 1997 with an overwhelming majority of 179 votes, it came as no surprise. On May 2, 1997, he succeeded John Major as Prime Minister (Brusselslabour.org). Significant constitutional reforms took place quickly, including devolution to Scotland and Wales, reform of the House of Lords, the Human Rights Act and the Freedom of Information Act. While the Good Friday Agreement helped advance the Northern Ireland peace process in 1998, it was one of his greatest victories (Davis).

He joined the American bombing of Iraq in 1998 because his conviction become stronger that Britain needed to be more involved in international politics. The turning point came in 1999, when he took serious risks to protect the Kosovans and explained his ideas about "liberal intervention" in his "Chicago" speech "The Doctrine of the International Community". A booming economy and a dismal performance by the Conservative Party enabled Labor to win the 2001 general election with a landslide victory of 167 seats. Bringing the pace of public sector transformation was his primary goal for the second term. This was

manifested in the Prime Minister's Delivery Unit, bills concerning university tuition fees, Academy Schools, Foundation Hospitals, and the growing "choice agenda." Events hindered his plans to hold a referendum on Britain's adoption of the Euro. The terrorist acts of 9/11 turned into pivotal events in Tony Blair's life and career. In order to combat radical Islamism, he sided with the United States and President Bush in Afghanistan in 2001 then, in a far more contentious move, in Iraq in 2003. The notion that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction (WMD), which were later disproved, served as the foundation for the war argument in the United Kingdom. This, together with complaints about the government's use of its apparatus and questions about the UK's legality in getting involved, made the once-popular Tony Blair a contentious figure (Davis).

In 2005, Labor won a third general election under his leadership, although by a somewhat smaller but still significant majority of 66. British-Muslim suicide bombers 7/7, The London bombings encouraged Blair to try to tighten civil liberties, another cause of public division.2006 Israel-Lebanon war Labor rebelled against Tony Blair because he did not want to criticize Israel and he continued to support Bush. He resigned as prime minister on June 27 (Davis).

2.1.1 Blair's Leadership in the Early Years

Blair's early years as a prime minister saw success with his leadership style, boosting his sense of confidence. Not interested in foreign policy or military intervention, Blair got drawn into international affairs and early choose   to send British forces to Kosovo in December 1998 after talks with Serbia broke down. Kosovo gave him an opportunity to understand this matter more clearly, his foreign policy priorities, which he outlined in a speech in Chicago in April 1999. This came to be known as the doctrine of the international community, it showed the linked of states in the new globalized world and creating the conditions that made military intervention legitimate.

What is interesting about the speech is that it was delivered by well-known academic Lawrence Freedman, not the usual State Department channel, which went largely unnoticed. The Hill reported that the Foreign Commonwealth Office (FCO) was not consulted and the result caused shock and anger in Aung Charles Street. Especially among the senior lawyers, whose territory it immediately invaded (Hill 344). Blair himself wrote: "I was extraordinarily advanced in the search for a military solution from many of our allies were outraged and much of our system, to my surprise, was completely and relentlessly in favor of evil, not peace" (Blair 227). This seems to be a very personal decision followed by aides, whose diplomacy only Jonathan knew Powell (Riddell 32).

Blair is proud of persuading President Clinton to consider sending troops into the country when the areal campaign appeared ineffectual. His description says a lot about his judgment to making a process, I made a clear decision then. I spoke to Alistair [Campbell] and Jonathan [Powell] and then put together a tight team. "I said I'm ready to lose my job, but we're getting a divorce. We are even more in the lead on the front line and we will win everything" (Blair 237). At the time, none looked to be aware that it was a highly personal choice because it wasn't controversial and Blair enjoyed broad cross-party support in parliament specifically from both opposition parties. The House of Commons did not hold a formal vote on the act, but opponents of the war (mostly in the backbench of the Labor Party) received only 11 votes. By that time, Blair was convinced that he was a leader not only domestically, but internationally, and that he could influence American power. This position was strengthened the following year when British soldiers were sent to the former British Sierra Leone. A smaller operation to support UN forces and Ahmed Tejan Kabbah was elected president. Tony Blair made the decision for Operation Palliser, who in his memoirs makes no reference to or to any debate about Kosovo in government or parliament (Blair 247).

Once again, general agreement, especially if the procedure was effective, during his first term, Blair was able to establish his personal leaders at home with large majorities in the House of Commons and Lords, as well as transfer decision-making to the Prime minister at 10 Downing Street and show his leadership abroad, through personal connections with US President Bill Clinton and in the European Union (Riddell). Thus his authority was well - established.

2.1.2 The Limits of Blair's Power

What was the duration of Blair's power? The challenge in keeping control over the elite is shown by the fact that its members had to put out their time, effort, resources and creativity in order to manage it. In addition, it was not always fully successful especially when it comes to union relations. In Gould's opinion, New Labor "defined for most voters"by its "willingness to embrace and manage unions" while Blair noted a pro-business stand as "a fundamental tenet of New Labor" (Minkin). The main focus for Blairites   was the union obstacle to "modernization" of the party and some hoped to end that link. They later tried to significantly reduce the role of the unions.

It was extensively exaggerated that trade unions had power over the party before Blair's election as leader, as Minkin showed in The Contentious Alliance. Despite union behavior was limited by standards and contracts promoting loyalty and accommodation, organized labor was able to make significant concessions in certain places; like labor laws as well as the mini pay. The Blairite leaders discovered this situation infuriating. They attacked the excessively privileged role of trade unions in party structures. In fact, they usually see unions leaders as meddlers, "serving their own interests" and "outside their party" (Minkin). They were unable to change their relationship, though. In fact, much to the disappointment of party leaders, union influence grew during the latter years of Labor government as non-union

financing sources disappeared and unions created a more effective, powerful cooperation and targeted action. The Blairites had a lot of unfinished business here.

"Blair Power" had other limits. These were continuous and often large-scale rebellions opposing the government in the House of Commons, however the Parliamentary Labor Party and NEC leaders had little disciplinary power at their disposal and dissidents who persevered were never given harsh punishments. With time, it became more so. Blair was often annoyed by his own limitations and having to make changes.

In addition, the leadership of the Labor Party made big mistakes. As Minkin argues, his judgment was sometimes clouded by the faith and moral rectitude that made Blair such an effective actor. Two major instances where his efforts to obstruct the candidacy of Rhodri Morgan (Prime Minister of Wales) and Ken Livingstone (Mayor of London). Leaders of the Blairite party crushed the opposition with the powerful weapons of "Control Freaks" that included interfering with internal voting tools. Such actions have significant backfire. First, Minister of Wales Rhodri Morgan was elected, and London Mayor Ken Livingstone was also elected. In addition, the "craze for control" generated massive negative press, created greater anger towards "overbearing or threatening leadership", and even though it continued, the anger it generated helped increase the legitimacy of leaders (Shaw 156).

2.2. Tony Blair's Doctrine

The Blair Doctrine shaped British foreign policy from 1997 to 2007 and the special US-UK relationship, perhaps even beyond. The doctrine was based on three principles: humanitarian intervention, Britain's role as a bridge between Europe and the United States, and Britain's central role in international relations. In April 1999, Blair launched the "doctrine of the international community" as the war in Kosovo reached its climax, a doctrine based on apparently benevolent humanitarian principles and promoting a universal moral approach to eradicating tyranny and spreading democratic liberalism as its motive (Atkins 277).

2.2.1 Humanitarian Interventionism

Some governments describe military intervention in other countries as humanitarian intervention, and international opinion is not convinced, and this law contains no definitions of that name and is illegal. If there is a humanitarian intervention, it must be accompanied by everything conditional and desirable and related to all so-called humanitarian interventions where it preserves and protects rights and protects humanity against violations.

Humanitarian intervention "is thus based on the use of armed force by a state or group of states, or the threat of an international body protecting human rights against obvious violations by a state against its own citizens, thus denying their rights in a way that shocks humanity" (qtd. in Jayakumar 1). There is also any pressure from the government of a country on the government of another country to ensure that the actions of the latter comply with humanitarian law, respecting the fundamental rights of the individual, if the country is unable or unwilling to do that to protect his people. The United States was one of the first countries to adopt this principle (Jayakumar 1).

It can be said that the issue of intervention for humanitarian reasons is not considered a new phenomenon in the field of international relations. Its forms and uses have evolved over the last few centuries. It uses force on behalf of humanity to end oppression and state cruelty against its citizens. The war in Kosovo made Tony Blair accept humanitarian intervention; it challenged his beliefs and wisdom as a strong leader in crises and wars. He justified his campaign as a humanitarian war in Kosovo and on humanitarian grounds as a justification for British military intervention (McCourt 247).

Human intervention is the challenge of the future in the global system. Should military interventions protect individuals and atrocities under international law? This topic has attracted interest far beyond military interventions. In this context, countries like Great Britain and the United States can use such interventions as a pretext to intervene to start wars after the

fact. Britain, led by Blair, was the most active in NATO's intervention in Kosovo. It was not without motivation; Blair was the most persuasive of the military decision-makers, deliberately seeking international support to ensure the success of NATO, which could ruin his political career and Kosovo could spell his end. He said that Britain did what had to be done and what was right, for Britain and for Europe, for a world that believes that barbarism has no right to defeat justice (McCourt 256).

2.2.2 Britain as a Pivotal Power

New Labor transformed British foreign policy by introducing a new basis and integrating its moral dimension, which significantly changed the context, especially after the events of September 11. In Tony Blair's first speech on British foreign policy in November 1997, the minister took the futuristic view that Britain could play an active role in foreign relations after decades of relative economic decline. His speech was based on extensive national reform after separating Great Britain from foreign affairs.

Blair understood that cooperation with the United States would not be just verbal support. Military support was an important factor in achieving common interests. On the one hand this cooperation strengthened the position of Great Britain and on the other hand it allowed Great Britain to influence American strategies. The UK has many different relationships in all areas and has a distinctive foreign policy. Blair said "The strengths of our history will be used to build our future not as a great power, but as a middle power at the center of the world and world-shaping alliances and international politics its future. Britain must be inclusive, open, dynamic, a partner and, where possible, a leader of ideas and influence (Wither 71).

2.2.3 Britain as a Bridge

The United States and Britain had an important place in Europe, and Britain played a central role in building the North Atlantic Alliance. Britain and America saw excellent

cooperation in various areas of military cooperation and the development of American air bases in Britain and other security cooperation to prevent Soviet advances. Britain was a key factor in maintaining and balancing intercontinental relations in North America and in renewing American commitment to the defense of Europe. Thus, Britain became a geographic and political bridge between America and Europe (Wallace and Philips 2).

Since 1999, Blair's goal has been to make Britain the central power at the center of the alliances and policies that shape the world and its future. He said it played a key role in building relations between Europe and America and was a model for cross-border foreign relations. Blair managed to navigate an empty road despite the occasional tug-of-war between Europe and America. The United States continued to use NATO as a collective defense mechanism and system as a policy to ensure the commitment of European countries to politics, strategy and foreign policy and prevent Europe from forming an independent defense structure, which enabling him to gain advantages that could threaten the power of the United States (Chilcoat et. al 51).

At the same time, the United States supported NATO in many development projects outside the European region, and this helped the American position in the Middle East, especially in the oil-rich areas strategically placed to serve. the United States, noted that "NATO expansion has given the United States an advantage over the Middle East and the oil-rich and strategically located Central Asian republics, not only in oil, of course, but also in the fight against terrorism" (Chilcoat et. al 51).

Despite the post-2003 tensions, Blair remained committed to Britain's role as a bridge between Europe and America across the Atlantic, citing Sir Malcolm Rifkind's statement that the bridge would be very unstable if it went too far in one direction. Gerhard Schroeder was also of the same opinion and stated that "traffic across the bridge was always almost in one direction" (Wallace and Philips 13).

2.3. Cooperation in Global Affairs

The British Prime Minister Tony Blair from 1997 to 2007, played a significant role in Global Affairs, exemplified in the NATO intervention in Kosovo in 1999 and the Afghanistan War following September 11 Attacks, which shaped his approach to foreign policy as a prime minister of the United Kingdom.

2.3.1 The Kosovo War, 1999

The Kosovo War is an armed conflict that took place in Kosovo from February 28, 1998 to June 11, 1999. This war involved the forces of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, consisting of the Republic of Montenegro and the Republic of Montenegro. Serbia, which ruled Kosovo before the war, faced a Kosovo Albanian rebel group known as the Kosovo Liberation Army with NATO air support from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since March 24, 1999 and Albanian military ground support.

The Kosovo war has been highlighted by academics, journalists and others who have published stories about British foreign policy during the Tony Blair years. The war in Kosovo helped shape British Prime Minister Tony Blair into a strong leader. Blair's fears that Kosovo would fall were allayed by international recognition of his efforts to bring peace and stability to the Balkans. A more confident, capable leader followed, committed to the integrity of British foreign policy, liberal interventionism, the theory of liberty and equality. In March 1999 air raids began against Yugoslavia and Blair was not convinced that it was enough. Clinton insisted on sending troops to the country, but he was not convinced, Blair tried to convince Clinton through the media and American public opinion. Tony Blair's speech in Chicago on 22 April 1999, his first major foreign address as prime minister, was the most revealing of his motivations for Britain's involvement in the Kosovo war. He considered the speech a perfect doctrine and continued to insist that Blair's policy in the Balkans showed that there was a government capable of heroic efforts (Daddow 547).

Tony Blair said that, while we meet here in Chicago this evening, unspeakable things are happening in Europe. Awful crimes that we never thought we would see again have reappeared - ethnic cleansing, systematic rape, mass murder. I want to speak to you this evening about events in Kosovo. But I want to put these events in a wider context - economic, political and security - because I do not believe Kosovo can be seen in isolation. No-one in the West who has seen what is happening in Kosovo can doubt that NATO's military action is justified... Anyone who has seen the tear-stained faces of the hundreds of thousands of refugees streaming across the border heard their heart-rending tales of cruelty or contemplated the unknown fates of those left behind knows that Bismarck was wrong. This is a just war, based not on any territorial ambitions but on values. We cannot let the evil of ethnic cleansing stand. We must not rest until it is reversed. We have learned twice before in this century that appeasement does not work. If we let an evil dictator range unchallenged, we will have to spill infinitely more blood and treasure to stop him later (Blair 1).

Blair's speech was a bit bold, but he managed to convince the US, NATO, and the European Union that military intervention was the only solution to end ethnic cleansing, systematic rape and horrific crimes, even though Clinton refused to send into the ground troops to Kosovo, Blair later confirmed, Blair's speech contained important parts, but the main points are Blair's arguments for intervention in the Kosovo war and his orthodox doctrine for peace and security; and also to the extent that Kosovo is an extension of Blair's domestic policy, where he said "we cannot stand and watch a great nation on the brink of destruction" and called for consideration of situations and conflicts that could be resolved. And then asked a series of indirect questions that seemed to be stages of certain interventions or these questions are explained as stages of military interventions (Daddow 549).

The Kosovo war was a long-term result because that war changed foreign policy and also the powers of some politicians. Blair thought he had achieved great success in Kosovo,

but based on the opinions of some scholars such as Edward Said, he showed that was an instrument of the United States and was also directed by Washington strategists and that it was part of the American plan and goal to expand and spread its control in Europe. Edward Said believes that NATO's policy is as imperialistic as America's policy of expanding and controlling large areas, and argued that NATO is a cover for the United States to extend its power beyond its own territory (Zarnett 121).

By strengthening NATO's resolve, Tony Blair used political communication strategies developed in the Labor opposition to expedite the end of the Kosovo war. NATO was militarily dominant, but the general public indicated that if the war carried on, we will lose. NATO chiefs believed that Milosevic could come out successful in the war of disinformation and establish a media agenda. The public opinion war was helped by Tony Blair and his press secretary, Alastair Campbell, who created a clear agenda that the public understood and launched a major political campaign to improve public opinion both domestically and globally, the type that previous presidential contenders typically employed. Campaign tactics were also employed to strengthen NATO leaders' resolve, which was on the verge of disintegrating prior to the Washington summit of April 1999 (Vickers 55-70).

2.3.2 The Afghanistan War

The Afghan War, is the period when the United States invaded Afghanistan after the attacks of September 11 with the support of several of its allies. American and British forces pursuing al-Qaeda terrorists overthrew the Taliban regime in a matter of months. The country of Afghanistan also fought a war that took place shortly after the end of the Afghan Civil War from 1996 to 2001. The main goal of the attack was to destroy the base by eliminating the Taliban and creating a base of operations in Afghanistan. At the instigation of the allies, Great Britain intervened to support the United States from the beginning to the end of this phase. This armed conflict is the longest war in American history (Farrell and Giustozzi 1).

The war was a judgment on two military operations in Afghanistan. The United States launched the first operation and called it the permanent liberation process, other countries participated in this process, and the geographical scope of this operation is the eastern part of Afghanistan, the southern part and the border of Afghanistan. Pakistan. The second operation, launched by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in December 2001, was established by a resolution of the UN Security Council and geographically in and around the Afghan capital Kabul. In 2003, ISAF joined NATO on 23 July 2009.

Because of the September attacks, the United States was able to eliminate al-Qaeda from Afghanistan. The United States seized this opportunity and within weeks launched the most important and expensive counterterrorism program in American history. George Bush promised to launch a global war against terror, claiming that the Al-Qaeda leadership had great influence in Afghanistan and supported the Taliban regime. The war on terrorism begins there with al-Qaeda, but it does not end there, and the eradication of terrorism will not end until every global terrorist group is found and stopped (Wadsworth and Jones 2).

The war on terror was unlimited and not limited to a specific time, the life of the war on terror aroused great interest in the United States and used the September attacks as an important topic to introduce the horrors of terrorism to victims, survivors and their families there were a large number of photographs and a visual war was intended to remind the world of the crimes of terrorism. Griffin noted that:

> December and January, the year-end "special issue" picture reviews
> also returned, as expected, to the 9/11 attacks as the most important event of
> the year. In doing so, however, they used photographs from the 9/11 attacks to
> provide visual drama for a slightly different narrative the ongoing "war on
> terror" in Afghanistan and "elsewhere." Images of the World Trade Center and

its victims were paired with images illustrating the 12 other sides of the war

(Griffin 389).

America used all available means and pretexts in the war against terror and intensified

the conflict, especially after the September attacks, which were a turning point in the history

of the United States and its nation.

2.3.3 9/11 and its Impact on the Two Countries

Terrorism is at the core of both national and international agendas; this is a very

complex topic. The international community needs to face this evil and stop it from affecting

the stability of global security and peace, so it must adopt many forms to resist it, which by its

very nature is causing huge harm to the world.

The relationship between Blair and Bush had an important change after the 9/11

events, becoming stronger. Blair, who promised to defend Bush, also stated that there is a

global war against terrorism and that the adversary is common. Thus, in this tragedy, we in

Britain stand beside our American allies, and like them, we will not stop until this evil

disappears from the world." The attacks served as Britain's trump card in showing to the US

its commitment to the special relationship (Sarfo and Krampa 378).

Although the discussion of terrorism has always existed in American politics, the

events of 9/11 in 2001 gave it more importance. Many foreign attacks and human rights

crimes took place due to these events. Following September 11, 2001, nations started

unprecedented wars against terrorism under the pretext of the "War on Terror," using all

available personnel and material resources, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq. Where the

United States and the United Kingdom intervened in the war on terror and chose different

political approaches. Despite their different histories, cultures, and political systems, the West

came together behind the same policy: the eradication of terrorism. To achieve this, they have

adopted various approaches and strategies. George W. Bush used the word "freedom" to

defend the war on terror multiple times in the United States, citing the threat that terrorism posed to international freedom. Blair views the steps utilized in the fight against terrorism as legitimate and acceptable, and he recognizes the moral principle he belongs to in Britain (Holland 1).

2.4. Legacy of Blair's and Bush Leadership

The Legacy of the Blair and Bush Partnership after the end of Bill Clinton's term, is marked by their joint leadership during Global Events and security issues. Notably in the Iraq war and NATO in Kosovo in 1999.

2.4.1 The Historic Legacy of Tony Blair

The great Labor success period that started so perfectly in 1997, known as the Blair era, is now strongly coming to an end. Being the only Labor leader to win three successive elections, two of which included a majority, Prime Minister Tony Blair stands as the most successful Labor leader in election history. She has effectively held the position longer more than any prime minister, apart from Marget Thatcher since the Napoleonic (Bogdanor 99).

Additionally, of the hree leaders that fell social democracy in the late 1990s, Blair among the most wealthy center broke from European government and was the only one to survive. Former German Chancellor Gerhard Schroder and former French Prime Minister Leo-nel Jospin both left their shame as really lost treasures. Blair's image is currently low despite all of this, and recent claims of party funding haven't helped. According to the election results, he is currently the least popular prime minister since the start of opinion voting. (Bogdanor 99).

This hardly proves the last decision of history. The dawn of a leading minister or president is not the best perspective to analyze its meaning. For example, the reputation of Harryin the United States Truman and when all of them left office, Gerald Ford was disappointed, but has continued advancing ever since. Finally, Blair's policy be remembered

for three items: his changes of the public services of Great Britain; a large number of

constitutional changes, most of which required place between 1997 and 2001; and finally to

war (Bogdanor 99).

Blair's first term was primarily committed to constitutional change. The Iraq War and

public administration reform dominated the second phase, which ran from 2001 to 2005. Both

involved making courageous, if contentious, choices. Blair was separated from his party by

both. But unlike the Iraq War, which both the British and Labor against, civil service reform

is likely to be supported. Similar to how Bill Clinton modernized the Democrats in America,

Blair will update Labor before assuming office. Blair changed the name of the party to New

Labor and removed the party's constitution the obligation to nationalize production,

distribution as well as trade. The first general election was held in 1997, after Labor became a

nationalist party where nationalization was not an issue. Instead of Normal Labor bromides,

Blair advocated a "third way" between old-fashioned socialism and unfettered capitalism.

Blair promoted a" Third way" between free market economy and traditional socialism. Tony

Giddens, a prominent third way theorist, claimed that Blair succeeded because he understood

the changes taking place in society, including the rise of information, globalization and the

fall of the working class- based economy created traditional social democracy useless

(Bogdanor 99).

Labor was stuck in the outdated belief that the public sector was intrinsically good and

the private sector was simply not good because of Blair. New Labor wants to get away from

this evident contrast. The basic principle of New Labor is that increasing market and private

sector expertise is necessary to improve public services. Therefore, change should be required

before funding new government initiatives (Bogdanor 99).

2.4.2. Blair and Bush

Most of the relations between countries have a common interest in a common goal, for example between the US State Department and the British Foreign Office, but an important aspect of Anglo-American relations is also the basic approach of the leaders of both countries. In addition, personal friendships between leaders can often help ease tensions during international crises. Opinions are divided on the relationship between George W. Bush and Tony Blair after the end of Bill Clinton's term, with many expecting their relationship to deteriorate because both were abnormal politicians. This difference has led some commentators to view Blair and Bush as an odd couple, given their strong bond.

Bush and Blair belong to two different departments. Each of them has special tendencies and thoughts; Bush stands for all things that serve the national interest of the United States. As for Blair, he supports everything that serves international problems, as Wither noted: "Bush is a right-wing Republican with an uncompromising approach to American national interests, while Blair is a liberal with internationalist instincts" (Wither 73).

Tony Blair's support for external military intervention in the name of peace and the world attracted the attention of many parties, especially George W. Bush. Blair was a European leader who supported many military interventions, such as NATO in Yugoslavia in 1999, and was also an American ally in the war in Afghanistan. Although Tony Blair did not oppose Bush's decision to invade Iraq, his goal was to reach an agreement with Saddam Hussein in which he would agree to cooperate without giving up power. Tony Blair's support for the United States in the Iraq war was not weakness or fear of America, but a demonstration of British power under his leadership (Porter 363).

Former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan revealed that former British Prime Minister Tony Blair was the only person who could change US President George W. Bush opinion on the invasion of Iraq in 2003. In addition, Britain was the only major power to join the war

with former President George W. Bush of the US. Blair later affirmed his right for taking part in the War of Iraq in his book The Journey, Blair confessing in the book that he cried many times, we talk about how to live with the psychological effects of being involved in the Iraq War. He apologized to the families of the soldiers who died there, apologized for the grief he caused and caused him to cut many lives short, but insisted that his decision was the right one. He did not apologize to the Iraqis, who led a war with hundreds of thousands of dead and injured civilians, the destruction of Mesopotamian civilization, which dates back to 3000 BC (Wither 73).

Britain is a leader in the use of soft power and is highly regarded in the United States. British diplomats rarely have direct influence on American politics, where influence has always had limits. Wither noted that "Britain's extensive experience in global diplomacy and its ability to apply soft power techniques are widely respected in the United States. However, it is rare for British diplomacy to directly influence American policymaking and has always been at the edge of even the most respected British influence to prime ministers." (Wither 73).

The relationship between Blair and Bush was affected by the events of 9/11, leading to a convergence of views shortly after the events. Britain's position on events in the United States is one of the most visible and clear international positions that has appeared on the scene. The role of Great Britain was made clear from the first day of the crisis with constant public statements and commitments to support the United States in all its counter-terrorism efforts, Tony Blair personally, and to obtain international support and support for the American counter-terrorism campaign. And overcome any obstacles that may be in the way (Wither 73).

Before the events of September 11, the relationship between Bush and Blair was friendly, but it was never like the relationship between Clinton and Bush. Government has been troubled by Bush's unilateral stance toward several agreements Blair's, such as the Kyoto

accord, which includes legal obligations that limit the emission of four greenhouse gases, and which includes legal commitments to limit emissions of four greenhouse gases and the US fight against global warming and other agreements. After the events of September, however, the relationship between the United States and Great Britain is closer than ever, describing their relationship unlike other countries (Wither 74).

2.4.3 Blair's Decision to Join Iraq War

The United States' primary peers in the war effort was Prime Minister Tony Blair, who supported President George W. Bush into Iraq in March 2003. Blair stated that he acted for the following simple and clear reasons:

We do not leave America alone to deal with these tough problems, which is the cost of the effect. When I say annoyance, I mean those that people would like never to have to deal with or wish were not there. Using an insulting term, I realize that America needs to deal with these people, but they prefer to be blamed for it. Thus, the US is unilateral when acting alone, but people fall when the US seeks allies. One example of such an issue is international terrorism...When America encounters these issues, we need to stand with them (Blair).

Blair and Bush had a partnership that broke usual rules. Under normal circumstances, this intimate relationship between a neoconservative republican president and a Labor prime minister should never have succeeded. However, following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington, the two men developed a bond that was stronger than any transatlantic partnership since the Second World War (Naughtie).

Blair's unswerving support of the US and the Iraq invasion led to years of difficult battle toward becoming Labor's leader and then the prime minister. It is almost difficult that he might risk his standing and remain at home in support of a cause that was unpopular in the UK and put him at war with the majority of the European Union (Schuster 223).

However, Tony Blair decided to remain with the US when coalition forces in Iraq were faced with an aggressive post-war insurgency and many other countries chose to remove their troops. Blair faced a high political price for his decision to do so; in the years following the at-tack, the British public saw him as "a poodle who simply followed the president and a naive and useless fool." (Baldwin).

His popularity significantly declined because of the war. As early as July 2003, in fact, a MORI survey commissioned by the daily Sun showed that his approval rating fell from plus seven in 2001 to minus seventeen (Baldwin and Kellend).

What motivated Blair to collaborate with President Bush to remove Saddam Hussein from power and establish a democratic administration in Iraq? Blair was clear that Saddam Hus-sein had to be taken out of office. On April 4, 2003, he was asked this question on television: "Can Tony Blair today accept an end to the war on certain conditions?" In reaction, he said, "This is not a war against Iraq; instead, it is a fight against Saddam and his closest associates, who have plundered the nation and are living in lavish palaces while people go hungry. Even if its own people are cruelly enslaved and abused, 60% of Iraq's population is dependent on food help".

To sum up, The British Prime Minister Tony Blair made a great development of the relationship with United States, various Global and International cooperation like the Kosovo and Afghanistan Conflict, Iraq War, following the 9/11 had a great impact in the relations between Britain and America. In addition, Blair was an important element in this development by making his "Doctrine."

Endnotes

---

[1]Al-Qaeda: is Terrorist group, was established in 1988 by Osama bin Laden. Its objective is to use violence and famine against people it views as enemies of Islam in order to establish an Islamic state, particularly in Western nations like the United States. Many significant acts of terrorism, such as the September 11, 2001 impacts in the United States, are linked to Al-Qaeda.

[2]Blairite: is someone who supports the ideas and philosophy of Tony Blair, sometimes called "Blairismo". Blair was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1997 to 2007. Most Blairites support moderate policies that include social reform, free market principles and historic labor ideals.

[3]Clause IV: in Great Britain, the constitution of the Labor Party has clause IV. Written in 1918, it included a promise to nationalize essential businesses and services, as well as the socialist platform of the party. That meant putting them under state control.

[4]The Balkans: are regions Southeastern Europe. It contains nations including Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Croatia and others and is named after the Balkan Mountains. The region is known for its extensive history, languages and civilization.

Chapter Three

Tony Blair's Influence on British American Relationships

The significant development of the US-UK special relationship in the late twentieth century was not specifically due to the international context. The noticeable challenge that both countries confronted was to play a major part in shaping the special relationship in the 1980s.The Blair tenure will always be considered as an important turning point in boosting this relationship.

The Former Prime Minister played a major role in establishing friendly relations between the two countries; He was a politician that had a great intelligence and political flexibility that allowed him to become Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. He also headed his own party, the labor Party, where he worked hard to change traditional systems and bring new political reforms. The development of relations between the United States and Great Britain was influenced by several factors. One of the most important factors was the strong bond with US Presidents Bill Clinton and George W Bush. Bush saw Blair as a resilient political figure who helped both countries to attempt their political and diplomatic interests which built on the strong relationship between the President Ronald Reagan and the Prime Minister Margret Thatcher both of whom worked hard to bring the countries closer.

This chapter will focus basically on the significant impacts of Tony Blair in shaping the US-UK Relationship that appeared clearly in the attacks of 9/11, and the personal Dynamics with US President that began in the Late eighties also the great criticism and opposition that faced Blair due to the support he brought to America on different political events specifically on the Iraq War in order to overthrow the Saddam regime. He also faced strong criticism from his Labor Party and the wider British public that see this as threat of the stability of the country and discussing the Assessment of Tony Blair Policies on British

American Relationships after that, the Impact of the Iraq war on British American Relationship.

3.1. Factors Influencing British American Relationship under Tony Blair

Throughout most of world politics, Britain and the United States have long-standing and friendly relations. Despite initial disagreements during the time of American independence, diplomatic relations flourished during both world wars and formed an exceptional partnership. There is no closer ally to the United States than the UK, and British foreign policy prioritizes close cooperation with the US. The shared language, values and democratic principles of both nations are embodied in bilateral cooperation (Mallory). Tony Blair strongly believed in the "special relationship" between the United States and Great Britain and emphasized the need for every British prime minister to have a good relationship with their American counterpart (Weiner).

The expression "friendly superpowers" can be used to sum up the unusual connection between the two countries, especially in this moment of trouble and complete war. Even during the transitional era, when the US was described to be "the world's richest and strongest nation-state," peace between the US and the UK flourished (Dobson 1). Both the United States and Britain were very friendly countries in the context of the events that followed, but they also had their differences and experienced several political and diplomatic problems (Dobson 1).

Several factors have contributed to the development of the relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom, the most significant one was the strong bond between President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair. Bush viewed Blair as a resilient political figure, which aided both countries in their political and diplomatic interests.

George Bush stated during the press briefing that he and Tony Blair had a productive discussion on various issues while sitting on the Truman balcony last night. And it struck me

again what a clear strategic thinker he is. First of all, it is heartfelt, it's open, and I appreciate that he sees the horizon back. And that's the kind of leadership the world needs (Weiner).

He claims that Tony Blair is a unique foreign ally who has continuously stood by America when others have failed to do the same (MacAskill). After risking his political career to support the US led war in Iraq, Prime Minister Tony Blair bravely and persistently overcame public opposition to his cooperation with the Bush administration and steadfastly argued that Britain and Europe needed strong ties with the US, one might have assumed that his pro-American foreign policy over the past year would have earned him some points in Washington .Blair's popularity was declining and he was being called America's "poodle" by members of his own party, but he was steadfast in his belief that Europe should support the United States both at home and abroad (Gordon).

Between 2000 and 2005, a series of terrorist assaults occurred. Recent events indicate a rapid rise in terrorism. On September 11th, 2001, worldwide terrorism attacked the US. The spectacular attacks drew global attention and provoked the Bush administration and worldwide community to take action against terror (Svendsen 39).

The 9/11 attacks led to a close personal and professional bond between Bush and Blair. Before the attacks, the two men and their administrations were at odds over several issues, including America's national missile defense strategy, the refusal to ratify the Kyoto environmental treaty, which cuts greenhouse gases to prevent global warming, and the International Criminal Court apart from specific policy differences, Bush and Blair differed in their political philosophies. As a right wing Republican, Bush advocated tax cuts and industrial deregulation. The US bucked a global trend and acted unilaterally, to the dismay of Tony Blair (Parmar). Tony Blair had little knowledge of Osama Bin Laden or al Qaeda prior to 9/11. The election campaign that had propelled Blair and his new Labor Party to victory had focused primarily on homegrown issues (Manhattan Institute).

Britain's decision to fight alongside the United States in Iraq was largely due to Blair's own character and views; he was unpopular with a large part of the British population and Blair's own party. For this reason, too, Washington should not expect Britain to automatically trust that the United States will follow it into another kind of war, unless the United States has in the meantime done much more to advance British interests and moderate British pride. Without such preparation, a new major US military operation could mark the end of the "special relationship" with serious consequences for US interests. This is especially true as attacks in Iraq continue and perceptions grow in Britain. Blair has involved Britain in a kind of low-level Vietnam in the Middle East, damaging British interests in the Middle East and increase Britain's exposure to terrorism. Britain has already suffered greatly from the accusations that he exaggerated the threat from Iraq, Part of his campaign so that the parliament supports the war (Lieven).

After the terrorist attacks of 9/11, Blair ought to help the United States, forcing British troops to support the US occupation of Iraq. He did so even the strong opposition that he faced from British citizens. A million of peaceful protests marched in London's Trafalgar Square shortly before US and British troops entered Iraq. Blair's credibility fell as the number of British killings in Iraq increased. When he was first elected, 63% of Britons supported him, relating to a recent You Gov/Daily Telegraph poll nowadays, the percentage is 22 percent. His continued support for the Iraq war justified as a crucial part of this decline (Wiener).

In fact, in leading his country to war, Blair took a greater political risk than President Bush did. Although Blair launched Iraq from an unprecedented position of political strength, he also faced much stronger domestic opposition. President Bush's support from the Republican Party was weaker than that of his own Labor Party, which was a significant source of domestic opposition. That is what Blair is going through. Blair was tasked with convincing his significant political allies that war was the right path towards peace

(Dorfman). The Initial verbal distance from Washington was a consequence of the Blair-Bush friendship unpopularity and the belief that the 2002-2005 events added extreme imbalance to the special relationship. Some American voices reinforced this common British perception (Dumbrell 64-78).

These events had a significant impact on British-American relations during Tony Blair's tenure, with the large-scale opposition he faced from the Labor Party negatively affecting his standing and his relationship with the United States. Blair was considered the closest ally to the United States during President Gorge W. Bush's administration.

3.2 Personal Dynamics with US Presidents

The relations of Britain and the United States were rooted from ancient times in many international forums due to the common interests between the two countries, and this was conveyed by American presidents and British prime ministers. During the Reagan period, Margaret Thatcher was at the head of power, and there were friendly relations between them and common interests for the advancement of the two countries. They carried out reforms that would bring a major change in the political path of the two countries. After Margaret Thatcher came Blair, who in turn strengthened British-American relations. He worked with Clinton to find a solution to various international conflicts to serve their interests, despite the different political orientations, among which Blair also created a strong relationship with President George Bush, as he considered Blair a close friend of America, also he was the first supporter, especially during the attacks of 9/11 and the war waged against Iraq to overthrow the rule of Saddam Hussein.

3.2.1 Ronald Reagan and Margret Thatcher Common Policies

Ronald Regan and Margaret Thatcher establish a strong relationship under their tenure. Their main goal was to establish new political era since they share similar interests

Margaret Thatcher was known as the Iron Lady for her strong personality and political intelligence, as she was the only woman to serve as Prime Minister in the United Kingdom.

Cooper James reported that Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan gained elections in 1979 and 1980 as a result of the international instability in the 1970s, the Cold War brought together Reagan and Thatcher's international interests, but they both committed to using free-market, and stimulus-based approaches this was achieved by negotiation. When they first interacted as world leaders in February 1981, it seemed evident that Reagan and Thatcher tried to express shared goals and cooperation in foreign policy, showing solidarity would enable them both to have political protection against economic problems at home and communism outside (274-297).

Likewise, it was a much more complex picture, which resulted from the fact that the US and UK economies were significantly different in 1980. Reagan and Thatcher acquired economy with high prices and greater taxes, which they were trying to cut off; but, unlike America, Britain's economy was largely defined by privatized industries and subsequently union control. Thus, while Reaganite and Thatcherite solutions may have been similar, they must have changed in significant approaches (Cooper 274-297).

It seemed like a strange coincidence that Britain and the United States would elect leaders who were both strongly anti-government and supporters of the private market sector and tax cuts in the same year. President Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher were both associated with a separate school of thought. This allows us to determine the extent to which Britain's and the United States' economic policies were under their respective leadership until mid-1985 (Ridel 7; Dallek 94).

Leonard and Silk announce that both leaders were aiming to shift the political center to the right throughout their policies. Reagan decided to modify half a century of legislation that had strengthened the public sector while opening the door to private-sector-led expansion.

Mrs. Thatcher did the same in Britain. Both leaders believed that government was partly to blame for their respective economic difficulties, such as high prices and weak economic growth, and that less regulation was the solution. In contrast, every previous leader since the 1930s felt that when things went wrong, government intervention was the best option (252).

When the two leaders lifted central government spending and the number of public officials, they prioritized the poorest part of the population, with cutting to social services and welfare being very serious. Overall, around 10 percent of government funding on low-income programs, such as aid to families with dependent children and food assistance, has been canceled or decreased. The British government was able to reduce public responsibilities, which took control over any tax cuts after 1979. Reagan, on the other hand, prioritized tax cuts, and the national debt and budget cuts quickly expanded to levels never seen before. As a result, in 1982, Reagan had to give up his goal of balancing the budget by 1984 (Hogg 34).

Michael F. Hopkins States that, Both Thatcher and Reagan expressed their desire for the world to acknowledge their close and mutually beneficial relationship through their acting. They repeated this claim in their memoirs. In her memoirs of her earlier years, Thatcher explained how she found Reagan to be a kindred spirit, someone who embraced new thinking in government policy. He met her for the first time after hearing about a speech she gave to the Institute of Directors in London in 1969 (qtd.in Thatcher, 372).

According to Halimah Abdullah, both have been strongly opposed to different forms of legislation (qtd.in Zelizer). Reagan also had experience in telecommunications, ecology, and business. Thatcher fought for health care. Both were harsh on unions and considered they were dangerous to individuals. Thatcher and Reagan met years before either came to power and spent hours discussing their common goal. The relationship progressed to the point that they felt comfortable speaking for each other (qtd.in Smith).

Dorothy H. Clayton and Robert J. Thompson claimed that, reducing the size and growth of government was one of the primary objectives of Reagan's presidency. The government would become smaller and more simplified, resulting in a reducing the complexity of the transfer of powers between the national government and state, Reagan aimed to reduce government size by cutting spending on unnecessary programs, targeting tax collectors. His plan included benefits for those who misused government resources and tax breaks for those who carried the burden. This linked the public and private sectors, promoting business growth and improving the American economy. Reagan's approach prioritized clear goals and shared understanding of government roles (qtd. in Cambridge, Mass 336-363).

On the other hand, Prime Minister Thatcher's primary objective was to reduce taxes and inflation, which would promote investment and productivity and encourage economic growth. Government aid is essential for industry, labor, and citizens as a result of excessive public spending. This unwanted effect of the government's actions was meant to be reduced by reducing the public sector. Social security programs were the largest part of the budget where reasonable reductions could be made. Thatcher was convinced that reinforcing corporate and individual productivity would result in a healthy British economy. However, other sources suggested different results. Social and political changes were then the most important means to achieve her goals. Thatcher saw the need to "educate" the public about the nature of the problems and possible solutions (even some members of her own party). Because of this strategy, she occasionally had to balance the application of her principles to avoid being overly isolated from the general public (Clayton and Thompson 556 -81). All these common issues show the strong relationship between Reagan and Thatcher and their political decisions help to shape their friendship.

3.2.2 Tony Blair and Bill Clinton Relationship

The fact of personal relationships, particularly the friendships between American presidents and British prime ministers, plays a significant role in the widely held notion of the special relationship. Personal relationships that appeared to define the Anglo-American alliance are frequently used to represent the history of the unique relationship. During the Cold War, the most well-known friendships were that between Thatcher and Reagan and Macmillan and Kennedy. The bond that Tony Blair had with George W. Bush and Bill Clinton was the post-Cold War equivalent. It is a very persuasive picture of strong Anglo-American interactions based on close friendships (Dumbrell 100).

During their tenure in office, Tony Blair and Bill Clinton spoke in one another that their job was to serve as "shrinks" that provide therapy to world leaders and solve a number of serious international conflicts (BBC News). Clinton spoke of "the vital center" at the 1997 press conference, while Blair mentioned the "radical center". The terms that both men use are exactly the same. Even while both leaders have occasionally been criticized for being politically aware and constantly shifting, what is remarkable is how consistent their worldviews have been over the past 25 years (Harris).

President Bill Clinton created an emergence political star to the White House at a crucial moment when destroyed communist regimes gave the opportunity to emerging democracies and European countries were gaining global control, Tony Blair was a brilliant politician with a passion to create a new world, and he quickly became Prime Minister of England. He and Clinton would become one of the twentieth century's strongest partnership, Blair's success in 1997 motivated the two men to promote their liberal ideology on the international level (Ferrell).

Bill Clinton during his speech to Tony Blair claims that: firstly, it has been an honor to welcome my friend, Prime Minister Blair, and his full British company to Washington. It

continues a long tradition of partnership between our countries, established by common values, based on a common vision, and willing to meet the challenges of this new era (Federal Document Clearing House). Clinton's speech when Blair arrived in Washington was very expressive about the importance and stability of American-British relations throughout history, and he appreciated Blair's skill in preserving this strong relationship between the two countries. The connection between the United States and the United Kingdom established between the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush services, particularly during Tony Blair's term.

3.2.3 Tony Blair and George W. Bush Relationship

The "special" connection between Tony Blair and George W Bush as leaders of their own countries had a greater impact on the development of their own national goals. Several factors influenced Tony Blair and George W. Bush's specific national interests. These included, for example, 9/11 and the powers of the governments they govern, but the importance of the "special relationship" remained consistent throughout their time together (Laidlaw 1).

Jane M.O Sharp announces that, When Bill Clinton replaced by George W Bush in January 2001, few analysts on both sides of the Atlantic expected a division between the President Bush and Tony Blair, as they did between Blair and Clinton. Prior to the 9/ 11 attacks, Blair and Bush maintained a friendly and authentic relationship, but it was more positive than that between Blair and Clinton (59-86).

According to John Laidlaw, after George W. Bush and the Republican Party took control during the 2000 US election, then-British Prime Minister Tony Blair and new US President George W. Bush were supposed to meet in Camp David. Prior to this meeting, there was conversation about the limits of what could be achieved. They were going to discover common ground. This was due in part to the liberal atmosphere. About Tony Blair and

George W. Bush's neoconservative traditions. Everyone had other obstacles that you observed before they met (3).

Bush's attitude toward the Kyoto agreement and other many ongoing arms control offers concerns to Blair's government. Blair's ambition for expanding NATO, particularly for maintaining strong relation between Vladimir Putin's Russia and the new alliance concerned the Bush team. Blair's relationship with Bush strengthened after the events of September 11th. Blair, more than other European since he was aware of the psychological impact of the attacks on Americans and stand with Bush (Sharp 59 -86).

Blair selected his words carefully when he addressed Americans following the attacks of 9/11, and a few months later, he was privately claiming that his rapport with White House staff members overcame that of the Clinton administration. To the surprise of some of his cabinet colleagues, he maintained that Bush was greatly valued by the opposition and noted his executive ability and flexibility of thought (Naughtie).

The connection between Britain and the United States was an essential element "in the decision to attack Iraq". He might state that close relationships between Tony Blair and George W. Bush influenced Britain's determination in the war. The Iraq Inquiry report offers clarity on a new conversation between the American partner and then the prime minister, in which Blair tried to affect US policy in Iraq by using his close friendship with Bush (Milmo).

The British prime leader wrote a series of messages and memos to Mr Bush without introducing them to his cabinet colleagues, looking to preserve the so-called special relationship while directing Washington's attitude to the attack. The note that Mr. Blair wrote on July 28, 2002, and which began "I will be with you whatever" (Milmo). It is the most significant one, it means that Blair will support Bush, regardless of the consequences that he can face, despite the great criticism that he would have specially in the period of the Iraq war, he was aware of the dangers that he would face.

3.3 Domestic Opposition and Criticism of Blair's Pro- American Stance

Tony Blair faced a significant attack from the Labor Party after supporting the United States in the Iraq War and his close friendship with the United States, where the United States is considered Britain's strongest ally. This became clear during Tony Blair's tenure, but this exposed him to severe criticism and strong opposition.

Tony Blair address on the threat of global terrorism states that: "No decision I have ever made in politics has been as divisive as the decision to go to war in Iraq It remains deeply divisive today. I know a large part of the public want to move on. Rightly they say the government should concentrate on the issues that elected us in 1997: the economy, jobs, living standards, health, education, crime" (Guardian Staff). This was a biggest challenge for Blair as he faced a serious risk for his political career. The opposition to his pro-American stance and his support for the United States in the Iraq War led to a significant political crisis for Blair.

 Tony Blair' support for President Bush over Iraq War was damaging and nearly led to his resignation, opposition politicians and critics of the Labor Party oppose government, arguing that it has failed to properly investigate allegations regarding the abuse of Iraqi prisoners and civilians by British forces (Frankel).

The terrorist attacks of 9 September 2001 surprised the whole world, the prime minister favors President Bush's "war on terror." Later that year, the UK joined the United Nations backed invasion of Taliban-controlled Afghanistan, it was supported by the majority of Labor members. The war became unpopular during New Labor's second term. Yet, the collaboration with Bush led Blair and the UK into New Labor's biggest opposition and foreign affairs issue, the invasion of Iraq (BBC News).

Tony Blair talks a lot about the importance of overcoming the gap between left and right, abandoning traditional notions of party allegiance. In the three years he led Britain's

opposition, he renewed his party restored its supporters and establish the first serious
challenge to the Tories since 1979, favored by earlier Labor reformers (Applebaum 45-60).

Tony Blair brought a new era for British politics. When the Iraq War came Tony Blair
reported in a speech of Congress, Tonight British servicemen and women are engaged from
air, land and sea, there mission to remove Saddam Hussein from power and disarm Iraq from
its weapons (Middle East Eye). Tony Blair found himself struggling in conflicts and the
public trust began to collapse after the success of first season. The world trade Centre was
attacked in New York and Blair pledged to support his US ally. This opposition was a result
for his standing with United States, the consequences of the war were the loss of thousands of
soldiers' lives, which resulted in the deaths of thousands of Iraqi, British and American
soldiers (New Labor).

There is a speech of Blair in the issues of supporting George w. Bush, "Here in
Britain we stand shoulder to shoulder with our American friend in this tragedy and we like
them, will not rest until this evil is driven from our world" (Middle East Eye). The invasion of
Iraq led to the decline in his popularity. At home he was to face a great opposition from his
own party and the wider public he had disappointed. Opposition of the British public as well
as the failure of his mission in Iraq, the Labor leader ten years in office, his term was ended
with his resignation in 2007 (Middle East Eye). These are the main factors that caused Blair
his popularity by struggling with great opposition from both his Labor Party and the wider
public.

3.3.1 Political Fallout within the Labor Party

Blair became the Labor leader following the unexpected passing of the leader John
Smith, and Gordon Brown decided not to separate the pro-modernization majority in a
leadership election. Blair immediately gained unparalleled power as a leader, which was
strengthened by Labor's victory in the 1997 general election. He was the youngest Prime

Minister. During his term, he tried to create a more youthful and modern image of Britain (The Political Shed).

Robert .w Aspinal claims that, the Labor started the 1980s as a divided party Losing the parliament election in 1979 to Margaret Thatcher's Conservatives led to demands for a total change in the party, both organizational and ideological. In the 1970s, the membership of the party became more politically radical. Many members were now university graduates and saw the Labor Party as a vehicle for radical or even progressive change (qtd. in Panitch and Leys 26-38).

The Blair government combined aspects of traditional economic management with new initiatives to create an effective management instrument organized around the principle of depoliticization. Depoliticization as a dominant approach involves eliminating the political decision-making. State leaders keep control of the key economic and social processes at their fingertips but benefit from the far-reaching effects of depoliticization, as a form of politics, it aims to change market expectations about the effectiveness and credibility of policy making in addition to protecting the government from the consequences of unpopular policies (Burnham 127-149).

During his time as prime minister, the new Labor Party leader recognized foreign policy. His excellent improvisation talents were well adapted to the inflexible nature of foreign policy. Foreign policy, on the other hand, allowed him to exercise influence without being subjected to the same specific examination as domestic politics. He was anxious to leave his own unique mark on foreign policy while still reflecting consistency (Hill 385).

Tony Blair's tenure as Prime Minister before-crisis when Labor was charged of waste and faced major problems, raised the risk that Labor could not understand that the crisis was caused by the financial industry's damage, for which it is responsible for the regulation failures that allowed this to happen. There is a clear evidence that Labor's fought-for position

on economic proficiency was severely undermined when the financial crisis struck, and that the party became dealing with the consequences (Hopkin).

Giddens reported that, the Labor Party has been the most dominant centre-left party in recent times. The term "New Labor" was an important factor in its electoral success, as it aimed to reform centre-left politics and adopt a clear political agenda. The values of the left remained unchanged, but politics had to change due to social changes such as globalization and the development of post-industrial economies (1).

Pike and Hindmoor argued that, Blair's leadership campaign marked a significant change in the direction of the Labor Party, presenting the party as an innovator of traditional values while preserving its own identity. Blair argued that the left had been on the defensive for two decades, losing intellectual confidence due to internal doubts, government problems and Thatcherism. He proposed to rediscover the true identity and mission of the Labor Party, showing that it was not a break from its past or its traditions (148-155).

Supporters of Margaret Thatcher's economic policies in the 1980s said that she had a big impact on the British economy and that her leadership had changed it. Thatcher was one of the world's first politicians to be identified with the concept of neoliberal economic policy, which sought to reduce the role of the state and maximize the market's dynamic power. In the 1980s, world leaders who shared Thatcher's views, like Ronald Reagan, followed her lead. Thatcher's economic policies in the early 1980s were met with strong resistance from the British Labor Party, which called for increased nationalization, increased taxes for the wealthy and greater union strength. These groups originated from various political backgrounds (Aspinal).

The Labor Party took office in May 1997. Blair and his allies were willing to show that they could lead a government and manage significant national concerns without

humiliating mistakes or "banana skins" (a metaphor attributed to Thatcher in her last years as prime minister). To this goal, New Labor adopted pragmatism (Shaw).

Bevir and O'Brein stated that "New Labour has changed the traditional ideas about welfare to promote a vision of the state" The state provided individuals with benefits, including health care, education, and, if necessary, housing (7-8). New Labor's welfare policy reflects the idea of citizens who are united together by possesses and rights associated with the state in a cooperative business that would grow the economy of the state; the state serves as a partner. It gives the people opportunity to develop themselves, but it is up to them to take advantage of these opportunities (qtd in.Fields 78-80).

The New Labor Party changed traditional reforms by introducing new ones in order to establish a new political age in Britain. Tony Blair's leadership of the Labor Party, both in opposition and in government, sparked widespread debate and criticism. Blair's success in this job is evident. Not only did he reestablish the party, which was elected after 18 years of opposition, but he is also the only Labor leader in Britain to win three consecutive general elections. Others believe Blair spent a golden opportunity to change British politics, notably on domestic concerns. Evidence of his reforming efforts in this area only appeared in the final two years of his presidency, which was already harmed by his decision to back the Bush administration's invasion of Iraq (Buller and James).

3.4 Assessment of Tony Blair Policies on British American Relationships

According to Jon Lunn and colleagues, Tony Blair's 10-year leadership was marked by an activist philosophy of "interventionism", which included maintaining a strong cooperation with the United States and a desire to put Britain at the center of Europe. While the "special relationship" and the question of Britain's place in Europe have been central to British foreign policy since World War II, many argue that interventionism is a completely new development.

The Blair administration had a number of significant policy successes. During his first term, Blair implemented a set of constitutional modifications that modernized the political system. Blair's primary interest was to enhance the public service reform. He was successful in introducing business concepts and ways to improve education and health care delivery. Self-governing city academies, which received funds directly from central government rather than local authorities, began to replace failing state schools, establishing a model that successive administrations followed (The politics shed).

Following the attacks of 9/11 George W. Bush and Blair, who replaced Clinton Bush, were placed on a "war-time stance." Blair thought that the "war on terror "was a chance to establish Britain's commitment to relations with the United States and to serve as a link with the rest of the world, particularly Europe. The effort to use Britain as a link between the United States and Europe in relation to Iraq was eventually ineffective. However, the "bridge" concept was later removed from official British speech (Lunn et al).

3.5 The Iraq War and its Impact on British-American Relations

In January 2002, Bush announced his plans to Tony Blair and decided to work with Britain to remove the regime in Baghdad. This marked the beginning of the preparations for the invasion of Iraq. Tony Blair didn't receive enough evidence by the Joint Intelligence Committee after leaving Iraq in 1998, making it difficult to support him. Blair maintained close contact with American officials in in order to prevent the situation. Blair had made it very evident by the summer of 2002 that the United Nations should tackle the Iraq issue rather than to ignoring it. The Iraq conflict is an ongoing conflict (Dumbrell 210).

The US-led military troops' invasion of Iraq in 2003 marked the start of the long-term armed conflict known as the Iraq War. But even after the war overthrew Saddam Hussein's regime, fighting and kept going to cover the struggle. The United States and its allies were seriously threatened by Saddam Hussein's government, according to George Bush

administration's multiple justifications for going to war, which became known as totally untrue. Additionally, US officials have charged Hussein with providing support to al-Qaeda and again no clear connection between Saddam and the terrorist organization were really proven to exist. Since then, the Bush administration has considered going into Iraq, in the 1990s, but following the September 11 events, it affirmed the invasion of Iraq during US National Security Council sessions, where the actual call to remove Saddam Hussein was made (Dumbrell 210).

America entered Iraq with the announced goal of overthrowing the existing regime and establishing democracy. Britain, on the other hand, was more interested in demonstrating to the unique relationship and playing the role of US ally. In Iraq, Britain lacked a clear strategy instead, it was focused to working with the US without shared or agreed-upon plans, and making sure that its job was executed effectively without agreed or shared plans. The United Kingdom was consequently unable to make any arrangements for Iraq (Betz and Cormack 324).

According to Tony Blair, Saddam Hussein is in violation of international law, and giving him permission to use his weapons is a dangerous action. He has demanded that if Saddam does not provide the weapons, (the allegedly existing weapons were never found after the invasion, they were simply used as a pretext to invade and destroy a sovereign country) the Iraqi dictatorship must be removed and the UK and the whole world must stand up to face the risk. Noted that while the Iraqi regime is not a threat, it needs to act differently and its actions must be changed (Chilcot).

The British government published a report on Baghdad's weapons of mass destruction, which they claimed had put the country' state in danger. Additionally, according to Blair, The US, with Britain's help, recognized that Iraq had to conform. American and British troops took place within the borders of friendly Gulf states, and the Iraqis brought back UN

inspectors with illogical circumstances (Dumbrell 211). In spite of Baghdad's cooperation with the inspectors and their declaration of discovering no concealed weapons, the British supported the American claim about the eminent danger posed by the non-existing weapons and headed for the invasion.

The United Kingdom made an effort to fulfill its duty across a strong bond with America during this time, but failed to coordinate with them or comprehend the extent of their involvement. Because of this ambiguity, things went badly when the British Civil Authority arrived in Basra, lacking clear instructions on how to administer its territory and lacking adequate human and material resources. In addition to relations with the Coalition Provisional Authority, which focused on the capital Baghdad and had less interest in Basra (Betz and Cormack 324).

 The level of military cooperation between the United States and Great Britain is exceptional in both the history of international alliances and the US's interactions with other nations. There is no other nation that contributes as much to the planning and preparation of operations as the United Kingdom did with the United States. In Iraq, American and British troops worked well together and quickly shifting to changing the situation as operations against Iraqi resistance replaced traditional phases of the war. British experts have observed that the British community was worried about the supposed limited effect of the British spiritual prosperity in the United States (McCausland and Carlisle 6).

Despite variation in power between the two countries, maintaining a close security connection was more important in London than in Washington. Unlike France, the UK has consistently maintained a power and leadership partnership with the US. Generations of British leaders who ignored Anglo-Saxon dominance have accepted the role of youth partner in maintaining a critical relationship with national security. For more than seventy years, the

close alliance with the United States has served as the cornerstone of British security and foreign policy (Wither 70).

Blair's cooperation with the US in the Iraq war came from his unique moral perspective on international affairs, which led to British military involvement. He emphasized the importance of America as an essential force in achieving a legal world. Blair argues that the war against Iraq was necessary for political reasons and to strengthen relations with the US (Kramer 99).

It is clear that Tony Blair played a central role in the removal of Saddam's regime. Tony Blair, with all this support for the United States, would have to overcome the opposition of all parties, the European Union, his government and the broad opposition of the Labor Party, He succeeded and showed great leadership. The prime minister had a great influence in seeking to strengthen the relationship between The United States and United Kingdom the two countries is intimately linked together since both had equal political evolution and shared cultural and political heritage. Because of their similar viewpoints on global affairs, the United States and the United Kingdom were always on the same path when dangers appeared. Two World Wars, "war on terror" tested the strength of the partnership between these countries.

Endnotes

---

[1]Kyoto Agreement: is an international convention that seeks to reduce climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It was approved in Kyoto, Japan, in December 1997 and went into effect in February 2005.

[2]Radical center: refers to a political Ideology or movement that promotes big innovative solutions to societal problems while remaining centrist or moderate. It opposes traditional left-right political differences.

[3]Reaganite concept: refers to Ronald Reagan's political ideology, programs, and leadership style. It frequently emphasizes free market principles, minimal government involvement in the economy.

[4]Thatcherite concept: relates to Margaret Thatcher's political ideology, programs, and leadership style as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1979 to 1990. Thatcherism, like Reaganism, promotes free-market economics, privatization, and a reduction in the role of government in the economy.

[5]Vital center: It refers to a political ideology that stands for a balance between the left and the right, seeking realistic solutions from both sides of the political viewpoints.

Conclusion

The historical relationship between the United States and Britain spans several centuries and has been shaped by significant events that have impacted international alliances and diplomacy. Their initial encounters during colonial times, which prepared the ground for the development of the "Special Relationship." It provides a comprehensive understanding of the dynamic relationship between these powerful nations by covering the American Revolution and the agreements that followed. Beginning with the initial arrangements that united Britain and America, it delves into significant historical events, such as the American Revolution, the Mutual Defense Pact, and the Polaris Sales Agreement, demonstrating how they improved military and diplomatic ties.

The United Kingdom remains a major ally of the United States, and the two countries will continue to collaborate in key fields such as military, security, intelligence, and economy. The Anglo-American connection is long-lasting and goes beyond individual leaders, with no rapid policy shifts by either country. It is hard to ignore the fact that the US and UK have a particular relationship. This partnership contradicts all other bilateral relationships. The special relationship proved beneficial for both countries. Britain was accorded special status among America's allies, which is widely recognized and respected. Americans have access to British facilities worldwide and receive diplomatic support for their efforts.

The Prime Minister Tony Blair played a crucial part in strengthening the relationship between America and Britain. The two countries are closely related because they both had similar political developments and a common cultural and political heritage. Due to their shared viewpoint on global issues, the United States and Great Britain were always on the same path when threats arose. Two world wars, the "war on terror" tested the strength of the partnership between these countries. Bill Clinton and George W. Bush fostered a stronger connection with the United Kingdom, particularly during Tony Blair's period as Prime

Minister. International crises and challenges were resolved through numerous approaches, including military intervention. Blair played a crucial role in developing European-American relations by serving as a bridge between Europe, America, and the European Allies during the Kosovo war and on other occasions, which appeared by the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, in America. The two countries prioritized the eradication of terrorism, which led to America's support for wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Works Cited

Abdullah, Halima . "Regan and Thatcher: Political Soulmates." *CNN Politics* ,9 Apr. 2013.

"American-Led War on Iraq", *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2, 2006, 223.

Applebaum, Anne. "Tony Blair and the New Left ". *Foreign Affairs* ,vol.76, no .2 , Apr 1997,pp.45-
60 , www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1mkbcp8.

Aspinal, Robert "The British Labour Party under Tony Blair Leadership." Shiga University, 2010,
pp. 25-26.

Atkins, Judi. "A New Approach to Humanitarian Intervention? Tony Blair's 'Doctrine of the
International Community." *British Politics*, vol. 1, no. 2, Springer Science and Business
Media LLC, July 2006, pp. 274–83. Crossref, doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.bp.4200023.

Baldwin, Katherine, and Kate Kellend. "Blair's Ratings Plunge after Iraq Scientist Suicide." *Reuters*,
22 July 2003, www.commondreams.org/cgi-bin/print.cgi?file=/headlines03/0722-08.htm.
Accessed 3 June 2024.

Baldwin, Tom. "Blair's Gold Medal Dilemma Has Two Very Different Faces." *Times Online*, 25
May 2006, www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/Print.do?articled=725694. Accessed 3 June 2024.

BBC News. "Blair and Clinton: The Peace Process and Fatherhood." *BBC News*, 7 Jan.
2016,www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics .google.com.

BBC News. "The Rise and Fall of New Labour." *BBC News*, 3 Aug. 2010, www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-
politics
10518842.amp#amp_tf=Source%C2%A0%3A%20%251%24s&aoh=17144142292285&refer
rer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com.

Betz, David, and Anthony Cormack. "Iraq, Afghanistan and British Strategy". *Orbis*, vol. 53, no. 2,
2009, pp. 319-336.

Bevir, Mark and O'Brein, David . "New Labour and the Public Sector in Brtian." *Public
Administration Review*, 2001, pp .7-8.

Blair, Tony. *The Blair Doctrine.* Public Broadcasting Service, Apr. 22, 1999, Chicago.

Bogdanor, Vernon. "The Historic Legacy of Tony Blair." *Current History*, vol. 106, no. 698,

University of California Press, Mar. 2007, pp. 99–105. *Crossref*,

doi.org/10.1525/curh.2007.106.698.99.

Bowie, Robert. "The United States' willingness to sell Polaris missiles to its European allies in the

early 1960s served as an inspiration for the U.S.-U.K. Polaris collaboration." Treaty Series

No. 59, State Department, 1961, pp. 1-3.

BPP. "Report from the Select Committee to whom the Several Petitions Complaining of The

Depressed State of Agriculture Of The United Kingdom Were Referred". 1821.

Buller , Jim and James .S Toby. "Statecraft and the Assessment of National Political Leaders: The

Case of New Labour and Tony Blair." *BJPIR*, Aug. 2014.

Burnham, Peter . "New Labour and the politics of Depoliticisation.» *British Journal of Politics and

International Relations*, vol. 3, No. 2, June 2001, pp. 127-149.

Chilcoat, Richard A., Joseph R. Cerami, and Patrick B. Baetjer. *The Future of Transatlantic Security

Relations Colloquium Report*. Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, 2006.

Chilcot Report. "Tony Blair's Iraq War Case not Justified.» *BBC Contributors*,6 July 2016

www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-36712735.Accessed 25 April 2024.

Clayton, Dorothy. H, and Robert J. Thompson. "Reagan, Thatcher, and Social Welfare: Typical and

Non-typical Behavior for Presidents and Prime Ministers." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*,

vol. 18, no.3,1988,pp.565–81.Qouted in Cambridge Mass 336-363.JSTOR,

http://www.jstor.org/stable/40574499. Accessed 14 May 2024.

Conley, Dalton.USA: How We Got from the Company Man, Family Dinners, and The Affluent

Society to the Home Office, Blackberry Moms, and Economic Anxiety. Vintage, 2010.

Cooper, James. "I Must Brief You on the Mistakes: "When Ronald Reagan Met Margaret Thatcher ."
Feb. 25–28, 1981. *Journal of Policy History,* vol. 26 no. 2, 2014, p. 274-297. Project MUSE
muse.jhu.edu/article/543289.

Coughlin, Con. "American Ally: Tony Blair and the War on Terror." Manhattan Institute, 3 Mar.
2023, manhattan.institute/event/american-ally-tony-blair-and-the-war-on-terror.

Daddow, Oliver. "'Tony's War'? Blair, Kosovo and the Interventionist Impulse in British Foreign
Policy." *International Affairs*, vol. 85, no. 3, Oxford UP, May 2009, pp. 547–60. *Crossref*,
doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2009.00813.x.

Dallek, Robert. *Ronald Reagan: The Politics of Symbolism*. Harvard University Press, 1984.

Davis, Jon. "History of the Rt Hon Tony Blair." - gov.uk., www.gov.uk/government/history/past-
prime-ministers/tony-blair.

Dobson, Alan P. *Anglo-American Relations in the Twentieth Century: Friendship, Conflict and the
Rise and Decline of Superpowers*. Psychology Press, 1995.

Dumbrell, John. *Personal Diplomacy: Relations between Prime Ministers and Presidents in Anglo-
American Relations*. Routledge, 2013.

Dumbrell, John. "The US–UK Special Relationship: Taking the 21st-Century Temperature." *British
Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol. 11, no. 1, Feb. 2009, pp. 64–78.
doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2008.00352.x Edition.cnn.com/2013/04/08/politics/thatcher-
reagan/index.html

Farrell, Theo, and Antonio Giustozzi. "The Taliban at War: Inside the Helmand Insurgency, 2004-
2012." *International Affairs*, vol. 89, no. 4, Oxford UP, July 2013, pp. 845–71. *Crossref*,
doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12048.

Ferrell, David. "Clinton, Blair Are the Focus of HBO's' The Special Relationship." *Los Angeles
Times*, 14 Mar. 2019, www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2010-may-28-la-et-special-
relationship-20100528-story.html.

Fischer, David Hackett. *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America.* Oxford University Press,

    1989.

Fontaine, Laurence. "The Early Semantics of the Neologism Brexit: A Lexicogrammatical

    Approach". *Cardiff University*, 2017. orca.cf.ac.uk/98760/.

Foroozanfar, Mohammad H., and Ali, Mohammad Ali. "Brexit: A Review of Impact on Future of

    United Kingdom Outside the European Union." *International Journal of Management*

    Research and Review, vol. 1, no. 1, May – June 2017, pp. 14-33. www.ijournalmrm.com.

Frankel, Glenn. "Bush Link' Hurting Blair on Home Front." *Washington Post*, 29 Jan. 2024,

    www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2004/05/13/bush-link-hurting-blair-on-home-

    front/a6501863-5722-4c65-9255-53d3b0eb8005.

Galantin, I. J. "The Resolution of Polaris.» *Proceedings of the U.S. Naval Institute*, vol. 111, no. 4,

    Apr. 1985, pp. 98-106.

Giddens, Anthony. "The Rise and Fall of New Labour.» *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 2010 pp. 32–

    37. doi :10.1111/j.1540-5842.2010.01179.x .

Gordon, Philip H. "Blair Could Use Some U.S. Loyalty." Brookings, 6 Nov. 2003,

    www.brookings.edu/articles/blair-could-use-some-u-s-loyalty.

Guardian Staff. "Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech." The Guardian, 8 May 2017,

    www.theguardian.com/politics/2004/mar/05/iraq.iraq.

Harris, John. "Bill Clinton and Tony Blair Have a Warning for Progressives." *Politico*, 22AD,

    www.politico.com/news/magazine/2022/06/02/bill-clinton-tony-blair-warning-for-

    progressives-00036616. Accessed 6 Feb. 2022.

Hill, C. *Putting the World to Rights: Tony Blair's Foreign Policy Mission*. Cambridge University

    Press, edited by Seldon, Anthony and Kavanagh, Denis, pp. 384–409, 2005.

Hogg, Sarah. "The Tax Muddle". *Time and Tide,* p. 34, 1985.

Hofmann, Sara. "Brexit will weigh heavily on European security. Here's why." *The Washington Post*, 18 Oct. 2018. www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkeycage/wp/2018/10/18/brexit-will-weigh-heavily-on-europeansecurity-heres-why./

Holland, Jack. "Howard's War on Terror: A Conceivable, Communicable and Coercive Foreign Policy Discourse." *Australian Journal of Political Science*, vol. 45, no. 4, *Informa*, Dec. 2010, pp. 643–61. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1080/10361146.2010.517179.

Hoover Institution." What Happened to Tony Blair America's Best Friend", www.hoover.org/research/what-happened-tony-blair-americas-best-friend

Hopkin, Jonathan. "We Need to Talk about Tony Why Labour Shouldn't Rush Back to the Right", *London school of Economics and Political Science*, edited by Julius Maina ,14 May 2015.

Hopkins, F. Micheal. "Margaret Thatcher: A Compagion to Ronald Regan", edited by John. L, Andrew et al, 2015.

House, Federal Document Clearing. "Transcrpit of the Clinton/Blair's News Conference." Washington Post washingtonpost.8January.2024,www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1998/02/07/transcript-of-the-clintonblair-news-conference/1b5e918b-e034-4ae3-b373-46497d55e9df.

Hunter, Boyd. "Wheat, War, and the American Economy during the Age of Revolution". The *William and Mary Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 3, 2005, pp. 505-5xx.

James Naughtie, *The Accidental American: Tony Blair and the Presidency*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

Jayakumar, S. Humanitarian Intervention: Prospects and Problems. Atlantic Publishers, 2020, p. 1.

Jürgen Schuster, and Herbert Maier."The Rift: Explaining Europe's Divergent Iraq Policies in the Run-Up of the American-Led War on Iraq" Foreign Policy Analysis, vol 2, Issue 3, July 2006, pp 223244, doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2006.00032.x

Kramer, Steven Philip. "Blair's Britain after Iraq".*Foreign Affairs*, vol. 82, 2003, pp. 90.

"Labour Party Wins General Election.» *BBC News*, 2 May 1997, www.bbc.co.uk/news/election97.

Laidlaw, John. "Bush and Blair: The Impact of a Special Relationship on National Interests." *E-International Relations*, 26 July 2011.

Leonard and Mark, Silk. *The American Establishment*. New York Basic Books, 1980.

Levin, Sam. "Donald Trump Backs Brexit, Saying UK Would Be 'Better off' without EU.» *The Guardian*, 3 Feb. 2020. www.theguardian.com/usnews/2016/may/05/donald-trump-brexit-uk-leaving-european-union.

Lieven , Anatol . "The Hang to Europe: Don't Make Britain Choose Between the U.S and The EU". *Policy Brief*, p.123.

Lindsay, Arnett G. "Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain Bearing on the Return of Negro Slaves, 1783-1828." *The Journal of Negro History*, vol. 5, no. 4, Oct. 1920, pp. (pp. 391-419

Lunn, John et al. *British Foreign Policy*. House of Commons Library. 23 June 2008.

MacAskill, Ewen. "Bush on Blair: "Some of our Allies Wavered. Tony Never Did.»*The Guardian*, 26 Nov. 2017, amp.theguardian.com/world/2010/nov/08/george-bush-tony-blair

Mallory, Waligora. "A Friendship to Last — the U.K. and U.S." *The Oakland Post*, oaklandpostonline.com/48456/politics/a-friendship-to-last-the-uk-and-us.

Marsh, Steve, and Baylis, John. "The Anglo-American 'Special Relationship' : The Lazarus of International Relations" .*Diplomacy and Statecraft*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2006, pp. 173-211.

Matson, Cathy. *The Economy of Early America*. Penn State University Press, 2006.

McCausland, James D., and Stuart, David T., editors. *US-UK Relations at the Start of the 21st Century. Strategic Studies Institute,* US Army War College, 2006.

McCausland, Jeffrey, and P.A. Carlisle. "When You Come to a Fork in the Road, Take It," *Defence Policy and the Special Relationship US-UK Relations and the Start of the 21 century*, 2006, pp. 191. 22.

McCourt, David. "Embracing Humanitarian Intervention: Atlanticism and the UK Interventions in Bosnia and Kosovo." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, vol. 15, no. 2, SAGE Publications, Sept. 2012, pp. 246–62. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2012.00532.x.

Mills, Carl. "UK-US Mutual Defence Agreement". *Context*, vol. 11, 2017, p. 6.

Milmo, Cahal. "How the Special Relationship Between Blair and Bush Shaped Britain's Approach to the Iraq War." *Inews.co.uk*, 7 July 2016, inews.co.uk/news/special-relationship-blair-bush-shaped-britains-approach-iraq-war-13283.

Minkin, Lewis. "The Party Connection: Divergence and Convergence in the British Labour Movement." *Government and Opposition*, vol. 13, no. 4, Cambridge UP (CUP), Oct. 1978, pp. 458–84. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1017/s0017257x0001976x.

Minkin, Lewis. *The Blair Supremacy*. Manchester UP, 2014, books.google.ie/books?id=_mW5DwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=MinkinL(2014)The BlairSupremacy.Manchester:ManchesterUniversityPress&hl=&cd=1&source=gbs_api.

Mix, Derek E. "The United Kingdom and US-UK Relations". Congressional Research Service, 2013.

Naughtie, James. "How Tony Blair's Close Relationship with George W. Bush Fueled the March to Baghdad." *Newsweek*, 11 July 2016, www.newsweek.com/how-tony-blair-relationship-george-bush-fueled-march-baghdad-477985.

Nelson, Craig D. "Nuclear Society: Atoms for Peace and the Origins of Nuclear Power in Japan, 1952-1958". The Ohio State University, 2020.

Niss, James D compiler. "Legislative History of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, Volume I :" *Principal Documents.* U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 1965.

Parmar, Inderjeet. "'I'm Proud of the British Empire': Why Tony Blair Backs George W. Bush." *Political Quarterly*, vol. 76, no. 2, Apr. 2005, pp. 218–31. Doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-923x.2005.00674.x.

Paton, Calum. "Blair, Tony, a Journey" Hutchinson, , *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, vol. 25, no. 4, Wiley, Oct. 2010, pp. 415–17. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1002/hpm.1069.

"Peace, Security and Defence Cooperation in Post-Brexit Europe." *Springer Science and Business Media LLC*, 2019.

Pike, Karl ,and Hindmoor ,Andy . "Do As I Did Not as I say Blair New Labour and Party Traditions". *The Political Quarterly.* pp.148 -155, doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12791.

Porter, Patrick. "Last Charge of the Knights? Iraq, Afghanistan and the Special Relationship." *International Affairs*, vol. 86, no. 2, Oxford UP, Mar. 2010, pp. 355–75. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2010.00886.x.

Ramsay, David. *The History of the American Revolution*. Indianapolis, 1990

Rees, Wendy. "America, Brexit and the Security of Europe". *British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* vol. 19, no. 3, 2017. doi.org/10.1177/1369148117711400.

"Full Text: Tony Blair's Speech." *The Guardian*, 8 May 2017, www.theguardian.com/politics/2004/mar/05/iraq.iraq

Riddell, Peter. *The Thatcher Government*.», Martin Robertson, 1983.

---. "Tony Blair Needs a Hug." *Foreign Policy*, no. 139, Nov. 2003, p. 90. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.2307/3183747.

Sarfo, Godfrey A., and Emmanuel Krampa. "The Transatlantic Relationship in the 21st Century: Security and Political Dimensions." Journal of International Relations and Development, vol. 24, no. 3, 2021, pp. 375-391.

Rossouw, Chrisna. *Jumping the Gun? The Legality of a Plea of Anticipatory Self-Defence in the Face of Nuclear Proliferation*. University of Pretoria (South Africa), 2024.

Schnapper, Pauline. "Tony Blair's Leadership Style in Foreign Policy: Hubris Without Constraints" *Leadership and Uncertainty Management in Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015, pp. 51–64. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1057/9781137439246_4.

Schuster, James. Blair's Wars: The Battle for Britain and Beyond. Cambridge University Press, 2015, p. 223.

Sharp, Jane M. O. "Tony Blair, Iraq and the Special Relationship: Poodle or Partner?" *International Journal*, vol. 59, no. 1,2003,pp. 59–86.JSTOR, doi.org/10.2307/40203903. Accessed 15 May 2024.

Sharp, Paul. "1846 and All That': The Rise and Fall of British Wheat Protection in the Nineteenth Century" *The Agricultural History Review*, vol. 58, No. 1 2010, pp. 76-94.

Sharp, Paul, and Jacob Weisdorf. "Globalization Revisited : Market Integration and the Wheat Trade between North America and Britain from the Eighteenth Century. "*Explorations in Economic History*, vol. 50, issue 1, 88-98, 2013

Shaw, Eric. '*Losing Labour's Soul? New Labour and the Blair Government*.» Routledge, London and New York. 2007.

Shaw, Eric. "Understanding Labour Party Management Under Tony Blair." *Political Studies Review*, vol. 14, no. 2, SAGE Publications, May 2016, pp. 153–62. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1177/1478929915623296.

Skinner, Geoffrey, Charles Mallett. *The Development of Nuclear Military Strategy and Anglo-American Relations, 1939 – 1958* .University of Exeter 2023.

Smith, John. "Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Great Britain Bearing on the Return of Negro Slaves, 1783-1828." *The Journal of Negro History*, vol. 5, no. 4, Oct. 1920, pp. 275-293.

Svendsen, Adam DM. *Intelligence cooperation and the war on terror: Anglo-American Security*

    relations after 9/11. Routledge, 2009.

T.W. Staff. "What Is Clause IV - and What Does It Mean for Labour?" *The Week*, 2019,

    www.theweek.com/103372/what-is-clause-4-and-what-does-it-mean-for-labour. Accessed 6

    June 2024.

Taylor, Robert, Lewis Minkin. *The Contentious Alliance: Trade Unions and the Labour Party.*

    Edinburgh University Press. 1991. Pp. Xix, 677." *Albion*, vol. 25, no. 1, Cambridge UP

    (CUP), 1993, pp. 162–64. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.2307/4051101.

"The Politics Shed – Case Study Tony Blair." Google Sites,

    sites.google.com/site/thepoliticsteacherorg/case-study-tony-SupportlWar", vol. 33, no. 4,

    2004, pp. 70-75

Tomečková, Magdaléna. "Jamestown, 1607-1624."

    www.digilib.k.utb.cz/handle/10563/46900?show=full

Vickers, Rhiannon. Manipulating Hegemony: State Power, Labour and the Politics of British Military

    Intervention. Manchester University Press, 2011, pp. 55-70.

Wadsworth, Douglas J. and Jones, Seth G. "In the Graveyard of Empires: America's War in

    Afghanistan," *Naval War College Review*: vol. 63: No. 2, digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-

    review/vol63/iss2/16

Wallace, William, and Christopher Phillips. "Reassessing the Special Relationship." *International*

    Affairs, vol. 85, no. 2, Oxford UP Mar. 2009, pp. 263–84. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-

    2346.2009.00793.x.

Weiner, Eric. "Blair Risked Much in Support of U.S.-U.K. Friendship." *NPR*, 9 May 2007,

    www.npr.org/2007/05/09/10102727/blair-risked-much-in-support-of-u-s-u-k-friendship.

Wither, James K. "British Bulldog or Bush's Poodle? Anglo-American Relations and the Iraq War."

    The US Army War College Quarterly: Parameters, vol. 33, no. 4, United States Army War

College Press, Nov. 2003. *Crossref*, doi.org/10.55540/0031-1723.2182. Accessed 17 May

2024.

Zarnett, David. "Edward Said and Kosovo." *Demokratiya*, vol. 11 no. 4, pp.109-143, 2007.