

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTER OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF ABDELHAMID IBN BADIS – MOSTAGANEM-

Faculty of Arts and literature

Department of English



MASTER

« British Civilization »

**Great Britain and the European Union from
1979 to 1998**

**Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of Master (LMD)**

Presented by:

Dja Bouabdallah Halima

Board of Examiners:

President: Mr. Cherif Teghia

Examiner: Ms. F Benmaati

Supervisor: Ms. Amel Ghermaoui

Academic year: 2016-2017

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	II
Abstract	III
Table of Contents.....	VI
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: The History of the European Union and the British Membership from 1945to 1978.	
Introduction	3
1. The Early Begin of the European Union	4
2. The 1951 Paris Treaty.....	4
3. The 1958 Rome Treaty.....	5
4. The Development of the European Community.....	5-6
5. The Maastricht Treaty and the Euro.....	6
6. The European Union Organization.....	6-7
7. The British reaction to the European Union.....	7-8-9
8. Conclusion	10
Chapter Two: Margaret Thatcher and her Policy toward the European Union from 1979 to 1992.	
Introduction.....	11
1. Margaret Thatcher’s arrival to power.....	12-13
2. The Westland Affair.....	13-14
3. The Bruges Speech.....	14-15
4. The Impact of her Euro-Scepticisme on her election.....	16
5. Conclusion	17
Chapter Three: Great Britain foreign policy 1997.	
Introduction.....	18
1. Foreign policy under Brown.....	19-20
1-1 The relation with America.....	20
1-2 Iraq.....	20-21
1-3 Middle East.....	21-22

1-4 The European Union.....	22
2. The relationship between The UK and The US.....	23-24
3. The UK and the EU.....	25-26-27
4. The UK interests in the other countries (political and economic).....	27-28
5. Conclusion.....	29
General Conclusion	30
Work Cited	31-33

Dedication

This Research is dedicated to my precious family. A special feeling of gratitude goes to my loving parents, who have always been there for me. To whom I am greatly indebted My success is mainly due to their help, advice and love.

To my siblings for their endless support and encouragement.

Acknowledgements

A special thank are due to all my family members for their encouragement and support, and specially to my parents, words cannot express how grateful I am for what you have done for me in my entire life, all the support and sacrifices you have made for me.

I am deeply grateful to my supervisor Ms Ghermaoui for her guidance, support, and kindness throughout the process.

I have it in mind to thank my Roommates and best friends for their support, love and encouragement.

To the teachers, thank you all for the efforts you have done for us for a better education and guidance.

Without you all, this research would not have been completed. I thank you all once more for your wisdom, kindness and contribution which made this research possible.

Abstract

This present paper manages to deal with Great Britain and the European Union from 1979 to 1998. This paper provides an historical, political, and socio-economic framework for understanding British history and politics. The work begins and concludes with reflections on contemporary Britain and the European Union, Britain's relationship with the EU has been riddled with doubt. Therefore, to provide why, how and with what effect the EU has become such a contentious issue in UK politics. It places the debate in historical context by starting with an overview of the early begin of the European Union and the British membership from 1945s to 1978s then, outlines developments and major changes of the European Union. Specifically, goes on to examine the impact of Margaret Thatcher and her policy toward the European Union from 1979 to 1992. To say it differently, the examination relies mostly on a British foreign policy, the EU's impact on foreign policies. Engagingly written, this work provide a comprehensive and up-to-date analysis both of the EU's impact on Britain and of Britain's contribution to the EU.

Key word: Great Britain, European Union, United Kingdom, history, developments, British membership, foreign policy

General Introduction

Broadly speaking, The European Union EU was formed as a result of the second World War to achieve economical and political goals. Six countries namely, France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg formed the European Coal and Steel community to encourage economy in 1950, and a treaty followed in 1957 to set up the European economic community. As a result what began as an economic cooperation has evolved into an organization, becoming the European Union in 1993.

However, Britain has consistently represented a difficult issue in the European formation. This state is one the greatest Eurosceptic, because Britain finds it difficult to link British and European policies together. The reasons for this were Britain's historical, traditional, institutional, and strategic, in addition, after debate and complication, Britain has become a member of the EU with less hopes , and things got worse when the Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher came to power with negative attitude towards Europe. Finally and after many years of applying the integration and trying to persuade themselves that the European Union is something different from the complex and multi-faceted reality it has become for the overwhelming majority of its citizens, but Only in Britain does a majority seem deeply uncomfortable with the whole enterprise, and the British appear to have had enough.

Therefore the objective of this work is: on the one hand, to show the emergence of the European Union and the British reaction and, attitude to it. On the other hand, to tackle the policy adopted by the prime minister, Margaret Thatcher to it. Moreover, to assess important turning points in domestic British politics, including, the politic of Brown. Finally, to analyze the British foreign policy vis-à-vis the European Union.

In order to solve this problems can put forward the following research questions such as: what were the reasons behind the formation of the European Union ? How did it develop? What was Britain's reaction? How did it get into it? What was Margaret Thatcher's reaction and policy to it? Finally what kind of relation between Britain and European Union, and other foreign policy?

So, the present dissertation is divided into three main chapters, apparently, the first chapter focuses on the background and talks about the beginning of the European Union, mentioning the historic steps which led to it, work and organization, and the British inclusion.

The second chapter tackles one other practical fraction which revolves around the policy of the Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, or to tackle the policy adopted by the Thatcher toward the European Union, finally the impact of her policy in Great Britain.

The third chapter and the last in this dissertation discusses the foreign policy of Britain. This work is an exhaustive consideration of aspects of British foreign policy or of every aspect of the operations of the Foreign and Commonwealth, the relations between states the, therefore, this chapter looks at the potential models for the role of UK in the world. In this dissertation I intend to finish the last chapter by presenting an over view about the UK's relationship with the European Union, if there were to be a vote to leave.

lastly, the conclusion of the present work stands for knowing the relationship between the Great Britain and THE European Union. Moreover it is expected to be as regards the predictable results that are supposed to be found at the end of my work.

Introduction

This opening chapter depicts the theoretical part of my dissertation in which an uttermost effort has been made to accumulate all the needed pieces for a better start of the work. The European Union starts after the Second World War as a result of a number of factors such as treaties. The European Union developed and became a continental institution containing all the aspects of the members of the European countries. The British relation was far and reluctant because of its economic interest, it finally joined it. Therefore, the objective of this chapter is to show the beginnings and developments of the European community and the British reaction of the European Union. To this end, the following questions are raised: how did the European community emerge and develop? How did Great Britain enter it?

1. The Early begin of European Union

Throughout history, wars broke out in Europe because of land, religion, and resources leading to terrible results. At the end of the Second World War (1939-1945) violence and

hatred did no longer unite Europe. In addition, Europe suffered from several problems such as being homeless, unemployed with no resources to live, so rebuilding Europe was a difficult task and demanded a lot of efforts, and in particular peace.

It led to cooperation among some countries such as Belgium and Luxembourg in the economic field as trade to be more competitive. In 1948, The Benelux Customs Union was formed, which permitted the free movements of goods, workers services and capital between them.

2. The 1951 PARIS TREATY

Other European countries spoke about the idea of unifying Europe. This was the case of the French political and economic advisor Jean Monnet and the foreign minister Robert Schuman. The former said that the unity would make the union's economy compete with the other steel European countries. The latter called for the integration of the French and German coal and steel industries¹: France had the objective to keep an eye on the development of the German economy.

This was followed by the Paris Treaty in 1951 which permitted the formation of the European coal and steel community (ECSC). It consolidated the production and trade of the iron, coal and steel in Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France, West Germany and Italy. It put an end to tariffs and quotas within the six countries. The Treaty of Paris also set up an executive council, a council of ministers, a common assembly, and a court of justice. This marked the early beginning of the European community because to more treaties were signed, which greatly extended the cooperation area.

3. The 1958 ROME TREATY

In 1958 Rome Treaty permitted the setting up of the European Economic Community. It included Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and West Germany. Its main objective was to achieve integration through trade among the six countries.

In turn, the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria, and Portugal formed the European free trade Association (EFTA), which reduced tariffs on industrial products, but not on agricultural goods. Three more countries from the EFTA joined the European community because the EFTA was much less powerful than the EC. This latter was made of nine countries namely France, West Germany, Italy, Luxemburg, The Netherlands, Belgium, the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Denmark, enlarging the European community. It was very successful in promoting economic cooperation among its members permitting their prosperity to increase². Still, much remained to do in the political and economic sections. Indeed, no general elections were held. Furthermore each of the nine countries sections still had its own currency, but plans for this were in the offing.

In fact, the European countries began meeting three times a year in the European council discussing financial issues, security, welfare and environmental topics. They succeeded in creating organizations, which helped to regulate the budgets and the currencies of the EU countries.

4. The Development of the European Community

In 1979, the first elections of the members of the European Parliament took place.

Progress was made to unify the European countries, and in the 1980s, Greece, Spain, and Portugal entered the European community, raising the number of EU countries.

Another important development of this decade was the single European Act. European would provide with the final integration of the nations, and the standardization of their policies on such issues such as health, employment, and the environment.

Furthermore, the fall of the Berlin Wall in East Germany, becoming united to West Germany and the end of communism led to increase the number of the European community. Adding these new nations and enacting the single European Act led to the European community to be interested in economy and the living standards of every citizen of the Ec.

In the 1990, negotiations and legislation continued to develop the new European Union (EU), for instance, the SCHENGEN Agreement was passed, which permitted people to travel easily within the member countries, without having to show their passport at borders.

Three more countries joined the EU namely Austria, Finland, and Sweden. In 1999, the Amsterdam Treaty was signed, which provided the EU with more power and responsibility, regarding its citizens. Greece had not yet the requirement in 1999, but fulfilled then one year later.

5. The Maastricht Treaty and the Euro

The Maastricht Treaty set up to make the currency of the European members common. However, the United Kingdom, Denmark, and Sweden decided to choose not to participate. This led to fifteen EU nations using the Euro. However, the transition could not take place from night to dawn. The Euro was used for electronic computerized transactions only³.

6. The European Union Organization

As far as the structure of the European Community, it was made of the European council, the council of ministers, the European commission, the European Parliament and the European Court of Justice. The European council involved government leaders who meet many times a year in Brussels and Luxembourg.

The European commission, in the turn, is the central administrative institution of the EU representing Europe. It includes commissioners from each member country, and allowed the European members serving for five years. The commission plans new laws, and makes sure those treaties and other international agreements are applied. It meets in Brussels.

As to the European parliament, it is elected by the member country citizens. It advises the council of Ministers on commission applications take decision on the EU budget and control the council and the commission. The Parliament meets in Strasbourg every month.

³Since 2002 The Euro (\$) was the only currency in the belonging to the Economic and Monetary Union (EMU). It also has made life much easier for tourists. Money was no longer changed at every border, and people who work in stores restaurants, and other places of business could work with one currency. However, 1/3 population was dissatisfied with its use at the beginning. For some people, it was difficult to recognize all the new coins and bank notes and it took time for them to be accustomed. The Euro (\$) is the official currency of 18 out of 28 EU members countries and known collectively as the EUROZONE. Slovenia began using the Euro on January 1st, 2007 and Malta and Cyprus joined on January 1st 2008³. But Britain refused to adopt it until it would be equal to the pound Sterling (\$).

Finally, the court of justice (the Supreme Court) interprets EU laws and treaties. It consists of one appointed judge from each membercountry. The court of justice is located in the Luxembourg.

7.The British Reaction to the EU

Britain preferred not to cooperate with the union during the 1950s, for two reasons. The First one was the importance given to trade with the commonwealth and the USA, and not to be restricted by Europe and its laws. Bavin, the 24th premier of New South Wales, had a strong dislike of supranational authorities, external authorities, which were independent of national government. He said that European cooperation had to be intergovernmental, through institutions, which directly represented member governments. So it was “a shift in the locus of ultimate political authority from national government to European government”⁴ (Glyn Morgan p59).

When the European coal and steel community set up on 18th April 1951, the six countries members left part of their national sovereignty to the community. British did not want to be under the control by an external authority.

Moreover, instead of joining the EU, British helped to create the EFTA (European free trade Association) in 1959. Until 10th August 1961, then the conservatives British prime minister, Harold Macmillan, negotiated Britain’s application to join the EU. General Charles de Gaulle doubted about the Britain’s real desire and ability to join the community because of the special treatment requested by the British. He was critical of Britain’s relationship with the USA (particularly on nuclear policies), put into question the extent of the British commitment to Europe, and did not want Britain as an eventual rival to the leadership of the EEC.

In a speech to the Labour Party conference in 1962, Hugh Gaitskell put the case for Britain maintaining ties with the commonwealth in preferences to joining the EEC. He said:

The Commonwealth...means something to us and to the world.

Where would our influence be in the world without the Commonwealth?

It would be much less. And I believe with all my heart that the existence of

This Remarkable multiracial association can make a great contribution to the

ending Of The ColdWar⁵.(Gaitskell,NP)

Gaitskell then added an emotional personal touch:

If I were little younger today, and if I were looking around for a Cause, I do not think I should be quite so certain that I would find it within the movement for greater unity in Europe. I would rather work for the freedomfromHunger Campaign; I would rather work for war on want, would rather do somethingto solve world problems⁶.(NP)

The Prime Minister Harold Wilson, re-elected in 11thMay 1967, called Britain to be accepted within the EU. But once again, General de Gaulle opposed it invoking economic reasons. On the other hand, the new French presented, George Pompidou suggested to the other heads of state and government gathered atTheHague on 1st December, 1969, to add other members to the Union. The Prime Minister Edward Heath, said that further European integration would not happen. *“Except with the full-hearted consent of the parliaments and peoples of the new member countries”*⁷(Alex May, p102).

.Throughout this period, the party was shared on the issue of EU accession and on the question of whether accession ought to be approved of by a referendum. In 1971, pro-Market personalities like Roy Jenkins, the Deputy Leader of the Labour Party, said a Labour government had to agree to the term of accession secured by the conservatives^{8,9}.

Finally, Britain left the EFTA and signed the Brussels treaty on 22nd January 1972, which became into existence on 1st December 1973 Prime Minister, Edward Heath was optimistic with Britain’s membership to the community, and that would bring prosperity to the country.

⁹On the other hand, the National Executive Committee and Labour Party conference disapproved of the terms. In April 1972, the anti-Market Conservative MP Neil Marten proposed a change to the European Communities Bill which called for a conservative referendum on entry. Labour had previously opposed a referendum, but the Shadow Cabinet decided to support Marten’s amendment. Jenkins as Deputy Leader in opposition to the decision.

¹¹ Indeed Britain’s poorer region made a profit from regional funds. Today.59 per cent of British exports go to the EU and Britain receives 54 per cent of its imports from EU countries.

He said: *“It is going to be gradual development and obviously things are not going to happen overnight”*^{10, 11}(Edward Heath)

The beginning of Britain’s moving with EU led to stopping its economic transactions within the Commonwealth. But it carried on contributing with overseas aid for the development of the countries which belong to the Commonwealth.

The Prime Minister Harold Wilson (1974-1976) called for a referendum which was about people’s opinion on the British membership in the community. The referendum was held in 1975 and the pro-marketeters won by a margin of 2 to 1 with 67,2% in favor, and 32,8% against¹².(John Oakland,p102)

British membership to the EU (1973) meant that EU law was now superior to the British national law in certain domains. It means that it has delegated the part of its sovereignty to the EU, which led to a number of challenges to the tradition notions of parliamentary sovereignty, and British courts. EU laws were applied in parallel with acts of the parliament as part of the British constitution.

8. Conclusion

Broadly speaking, Later on, the general elections of 1979 were a victory for the Conservative Party leader Margaret Thatcher since she became Prime Minister. Her view about Europe was negative, and, Great Britain’s membership was not well seen by her. Indeed, her period was marked by an increasing political isolation of Britain from Europe to protect the value of the sterling, to reduce the influence of the European Common Market over the British one and to maintain the past glory of Great Britain in Europe. In addition, the British tradition of a powerful parliament was linked to national power and in many cases,

Margaret Thatcher and some MPs Reacted transfer their powerful to European community Institution.¹³(Margaret Thatcher,and the EU David Ramiro Troitin,p126)

Introduction

This part represents the second chapter of my dissertation. It manages to deal with one other practical fraction which revolves around the policy of Margaret Thatcher toward the European Union. The coming of Margaret Thatcher to power changed the relationship between Greet Britain and the European Community. Because of the different event that took place such as the Financial issues, the Westland affair and the Bruges speech. To this end, following questions are discussed: how did Margaret Thatcher treat the European Community? How did it impact on her policy in Great Britain?

1. Margaret Thatcher's Arrival to Power and her Reluctance Towards the European community

The period under discussion was characterized by the role played by a female politician, named Margaret Thatcher. The latter was not always Euro-sceptic. For instance, in 1975, she fought to keep the UK within the European Community. And in 1978, she was for a common European approach to defense. Moreover, she criticized the Labor Government's failure to sign the exchange-rate mechanism (ERM) introduced by the European Community in March 1979 to stabilize the economy and paving the way for single currency, as the euro as that VAT battle¹⁴.

However, when she became prime Minister, she was known for her several fights against the hegemony of the European Community on Great Britain. Actually, after the end of a Summit of Presidents and Prime Ministers of nine country members on November 30th, 1979, the members were all in disagreement. When Margaret Thatcher was asked, by a journalist of the Guardian about intentions, she answered: "*I want my money back*"¹⁵(NP). This provoked a storm of protest and opposition. In fact, Margaret Thatcher's government negotiated a rebate to have some of the British money back, and her Chancellor of the exchequer sir Geoffrey Howe, claimed that Britain contributed much more than the other countries.¹⁶

¹⁴value added tax a value that is added to the price of good and services .

¹⁶Institute for culture diplomacy Bojana perisic Berlin, March, 2010.

One year later, Margaret Thatcher threatened to withdraw VAT payments in case the British contribution was not adjusted. The French Foreign Minister, Jean François-Poncet, answered: “*The nine have decided to discuss it with an open-mindedness*”¹⁷(NP)

Later on, the French President François Mitterand(1981-1995), offered a generous proposal to the UK consisting approximately 7 billion Francs, with the possibility to increase it according to the evolution of the British contribution¹⁸. Mrs. Thatcher refused, and the

battle lasted four years and finally ended with the victory of Thatcher. Nevertheless, it damaged relations with other EU countries. Etienne Davignon, member, then Vice-President.

Of the European commission from 1977 to 1985,said:”*our first mistake was to believe that what we had done six would be good for the countries that have joined us later...*”¹⁹ (NP)

Second mistake, according to Etienne Davignon, was the lack of pragmatism:

*It was obvious to that the British contribution to the EU budget was too high, but to change the allocation keys, it should touch the founding principles, and no one dared take the risk everyone.*²⁰(NP)

Another British error was the fact that they expected to have benefits from entry the European Union, but it was France the most beneficial. According to a British expert: “ *we had the note of budget but the economic benefits for our major industries, automotive and steel, for example, were in decline.*”²¹(NP)

This was followed by Westland affair.

²²Westland Aircraft company located in Yeovil in Somerset. It had constructed aircraft since 1915, Westland worked with other British firms to create Westland Helicopter in 1961.

²³ Michael Ray Dibdin Heseltine, Baron Heseltine, was a Welsh-British businessman, conservative politician and patron of the Tory Reform Group. He was a Member of parliament from 1966 to 2001, and was an important personality in the governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major .

²⁴ British Aerospace plc (BAe) was a British aircraft, munitions and defence-systems manufacturer.

2.The Westland Affair

Then came the Westland affair²²,opposing the American firm, Sikorsky, and Michael Heseltine²³. His battle consisted in keeping the helicopter company, Westland Aircraft company, Britain's last helicopter manufacturer, in European hands, by a European consortium. Indeed, he favored the integration of Westland and British aerospace (BAe) with Italian and French companies²⁴.

Mrs, Thatcher and the trade and industry Secretary, Mr. Leon Brittan, insisted that instead, the US firm Sikorsky should have it. In fact, an American company was preparing to take the company. John Graham Cuckney, a British industrialist, a conservative in the House

of lords, disagreed, as did Norman B.Tebbit and Heseltine.²⁵ Cuckney proposed that a new company would have a shareholder of 29,9 % to keep the the American away.²⁶

However the American company, Sikorsky, remained interested. Therefore in November 1985, Sikorsky made an offer to Westland's management. Heseltine was against Sikorsky's

Offer to Westland's management. Heseltine was against Sikorsky's offer, and called for a conference of the National Armaments Directors (NAD) of Britain, France Italy and west Germany to sign a document which compelled them to buy only helicopter made in Europe. It means that if Westland accepted Sikorsky, its helicopters, under this new agreement, would be unable to be sold to the four governments.

Thatcher and Leon Brittan saw that it was Westland's decision, and not of that of the British government²⁷. She delegated both Heseltine and Brittan to look for a possible European deal with Westland's management could accept. She gave them until 4 pm on 13rd December, and

²⁵Norman Beresford Tebbit, was a member of the Conservative party. He served in the Cabinet from 1981 to 1987 as Secretary of state for Employment, Secretary of state for Trade and industry, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Chairman of the Conservative Party. He was a member of parliament from 1970 to 1992.

if by then Westland did not accept the European offer, NAD's recommendations would be abolished. Westland chose Sikorsky's instead of the European packages. Thatcher rejected Heseltine's demand for a second cabinet meeting, because Westland's choice was already taken, but the tussles continued until the beginning of January 1986. Then, Westland Company had been sold to Sikorsky, which resulted in Thatcher's victory and Michael Heseltine's dismissal. And the controversial issue of Thatcher as her relation with Europe was in the Bruges speech.

3.The Bruges Speech

In September 1988, there came the controversial "Bruges speech". It was declared by Mrs, Margaret Thatcher, who was the Honorary president of the Bruges Group, in which she promoted the idea of a less centralized European structure to the detriment of Brussels. She said that:

We have not successfully rolled back the frontiers of the state in Britain,
only to see them re-imposed at a European level, with a European
super-state exercising a new dominance from Brussels.²⁸(NP)

The speech pleased the anti-European British, and angered the pro-European British. This was the result of a conflict over joining the ERM, which was a decision taken by Mrs. Thatcher to be applied in October 1990. The then president of the European Commission, Jacques Delors, called for the European parliament to be a democratic body of the community, the commission to be the executive body and the council of Ministers to be the Senate. Margaret Thatcher's answer in the House of common, which became famous, was:

The President of the commission, Mr, Delors, said at a press conference the
Other day that he wanted the European parliament to be the Democratic
Body of the community, he wanted the commission to be the Executive
And he wanted the council of Ministers to be the Senate No.No.No.²⁹ (NP)

She gave that answer because she was afraid to see her policy threatened by the EU. In Great Britain, her policy was based on the privatization of different state sectors such as water, electricity, telephone and railway companies, which made the government free from its

responsibilities, and the reduction of the imposition of taxes. So the spectrum of a European super state in Brussels would impose issues of taxation again. She affirmed that:

To try to suppress nationhood and concentrate power at the center of a European conglomerate would be highly damaging and would jeopardize the Objective we seek to achieve. (...) working more closely together does not Require power to be centralized in Brussels or decisions to be taken by an appointed bureaucracy.³⁰(the Burges Speech,Bruges,(NP)

Unfortunately, her skepticism about Europe contributed to her fall.

4.The Impact of her Euro-Scepticism on Her Elections

Among the pro-Europeans who were horrified by such a speech was Geoffrey Howe, the then deputy prime Minister. He left the government two days later, which speeded the beginnings of her political career's end. Before he left, he made a speech in the House of Commons, which encouraged Michael Heseltine to challenge Mrs. Thatcher's leadership.

But despite all her over Europe, Mrs, Thatcher did also sign the Single European Act, which created the single European market. In her 1993 book, *the Downing Street Years*, she defended the decision, saying: "*Advantages will indeed flow from that achievement well into the future.*"³¹

After being ousted from Downing Street in 1990, Margaret Thatcher continued to make her views about Europe known. She notably supported William Hague when he wanted to take the leadership of the conservative party or when he expressed his anti-euro currency stance. She also called for a "fundamental re-negotiation" of Britain's links with the EU. She did not call for complete withdrawal, but for independent agricultural, fisheries, foreign and defense policies. Even if she had to leave the political scene for an illness, she carried on saying: "*May of the problems the world faced have come from mainland Europe.....and the solutions from outside it*".³²

5.Conclusion

To sum up, the second part of this dissertation has been practical. Margaret Thatcher's period of power saw the worseing of the British and European relations. This was mainly due to the interests that British had and which were threatened by the European community. The relationship was so tense that it led to the fall of Margaret Thatcher.

Introduction

This part represent the third and the last chapter of this work , it examinesthe foreign policy of Britain²⁸. To start this chapter,Seen in a historical perspective we try to extract a set of ideas in the British foreign policy. On this basis, we will arrive at a matrix of British ideational as well as institutional contrasts relevant to the foreign policy domain.our main focus will be on .Therefore the purpose of this chapter is to give an analytical overview of British foreign relation and the UK's role in the world . To this end the themes to be discussed will include the following, can the British serves as a “bridge” between the US and continental Europe? What is the relation between the UK and the US.Andbetween UK and the EU?

1. Foreign Policy under Brown

The idea that we have to choose between Europe and the US is a myth.

²⁸ In this thesis, Britain is consistently applied as reference to the United Kingdom.

We are stronger with the US because we are in Europe, and a bridge between the two. (Tony Blair and Gordon Brown 1999 NP)

What is knowable about Gordon Brown is “something of an unknown quantity as far as foreign policy is concerned. He can probably be described as an Atlanticist and his pro-American sympathies should not be underestimated, though he will not be as close to President Bush as Tony Blair has been. His European instincts incline towards the practical not the integrationist. He has quietly supported all the interventions carried out by the Blair-led government - Iraq, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan- but the question remains as to how far he would undertake such interventions himself. As chancellor of the exchequer (finance minister) he has been keen on multinational initiatives on debt and aid, so he is expected to continue with these”(Paul, Reynolds NP). So what changes will Gordon Brown make to British foreign policy when he succeeds Tony Blair as prime minister?

On the broad subject of Europe's advancement and part on the planet, Brown clearly does not share Blair's of seeing Britain lead the EU to new worldwide expert. Genuine, Brown has dependably viewed himself as an 'ace European' in the feeling of looking to lower national hindrances among part states, and he has never appeared to have the same passionate connection to the sway of the British Parliament that portrays numerous Euro-doubters in Britain, especially the English (as particular quite from the Scots and the Welsh.) While broadly careful about the attractions of the euro set up of the British pound, he acknowledges that Britain picks up financially through its participation in the EU.

With think-tanks close to the Labour Party, such as the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), declaring British foreign policy during the Blair premiership to be a “mixed picture” and arguing that his successor needed to “jettison the worst features”, it seemed likely that there would be some changes in British foreign policy in the post-Blair era.(Cambridge, 2007 NP)

Ian Davis, Co-Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council, writing just as Brown took office, predicted:

Brown's foreign policy will be similar to Blair's. But expect new shades and tones [...]as a rough guide, a Brown foreign policy is likely to be a little less pro-Bush,

more cautious about the deployment of British troops overseas, more explicitly

multilateralist and more engaged with the global justice agenda than that of

Tony Blair.²⁹(Gorden Brown, NP)

The Brown Government has sought to recast the philosophy underpinning interventionism. The broad principle has been retained but there have been significant changes in tone and emphasis. Gordon Brown's first major foreign policy speech in November 2007 spoke of "hard-headed intervention" but noticeably prioritised "reform of our international rules and institutions" rather than the exercise of 'hard power' or promoting universal values.³⁰ Observers also argue that he has maintained a clearer distinction in his speeches between interests and values than Blair did and that "pragmatism has replaced idealism at Number 10".³⁶ (NA,NP)

1-1 The Relation with America:

In any case, Mr Brown has close binds to the United States, is absolutely not eventually unfriendly to American and his won't be an against American government. He is involved with and in sensitivity for US legislative issues and history, knows various American political, especially Democratic, pioneers well and events at Cape Cod. He may disillusion the individuals who need Britain to make a definitive break with the Bush organization. A ton will rely on upon the choices he assumes control Iraq.

1-2Iraq:

Brown has not t moved in an opposite direction from the choice to attack Iraq, yet has indicated he will investigate to what extent the troops may remain. He said as of late: "I assume my liability as an individual from the Cabinet for the aggregate choices that we made, and I trust they were the correct choices, yet we're at another stage now." Current British strategy is to regroup the troops there into one base. Mr Blair has dependably demanded that the troops should remain until conditions for strength are correct. Mr Brown, in any case, has space to move since he could decipher those conditions all the more adaptably. This could be the trial of how far he is set up to veer from US approach. His own particular military guides may likewise instruct him to get out as fast as would be prudent, maybe inside a year, to stay away from armed force overstretch.

²⁹ "Gordon Brown PM: A new dawn in UK foreign policy or business as usual?"

³⁵ In the speech, he referred to the EU, UN, G8, IMF and World Bank as candidates for reform. One of the new roles of the World Bank, as he sees it, is to become "a bank for the environment".

³⁶ "No crusades for Brown", Daily Telegraph, 18 March 2008

The Iraq war is perhaps highlights the USA'S super power status. In spite of huge international opposition, the US invaded Iraq anyway and stayed there for over a decade, leading to hundred of thousand of civilian deaths.

Although, the reason president bush gave for the conflict was the believed existence of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), others argue that the real reason was because which would be crucial to the nation's sustainability.

1-3 Middle east:

Gordon Brown has not appeared as much enthusiasm for Israel/Palestine issues as Tony Blair has. England accordingly is not anticipated that would assume a noteworthy part under a Brown prevalence, which will most likely perceive the restricted impact that any single European nation can apply. . One of Mr Brown's fundamental regions of intrigue could be in monetary advancement for the Palestinians. On a visit to Israel and the Palestinian domains in 2005, he got Israeli and Palestinian financial pastors together without precedent for some years.

The US is very much involved in the Arab- Israeli conflict. In basic terms, the US backs Israel although it has in recent years sought to bring about peace in the region. However; Israelis and Palestinians continue to fight.

Although Obama condemned the violence eventually helped to bring about a ceasefire, The US defended Israel's right to defend itself against rocket attacks from Palestinian militants. The US has given billions of dollars worth of aid to Israel since the 1980s. In addition to financial and military aid, the United States also provides political support to Israel. In most of these cases, the US has been the only state to veto and has done so in defence of Israel.

Relations have evolved from an initial US policy of sympathy and support for the creation of a Jewish homeland after World War 2 to an unusual partnership that links a small but militarily powerful Israel, dependent on the United States for its economic and military strength, with the American superpower trying to balance other competing interests in the region.

Others maintain that Israel is a strategic ally, and that US relations with Israel strengthen the US presence in the Middle East. So the US has shown its influence by supporting the state of Israel consistently since the 1940s. In spite of the fact that it is a Jewish country surrounded by Arab nations, Israel continues to prosper, largely continues to prosper, largely as a result of US backing. However, many other countries have condemned recent Israeli action against

Palestinians and so it could be that in the future the US may find itself increasingly isolated in its support for Israel.

1-4 European Union:

The European Union (EU) is an economic and political federation consisting of twenty-seven member countries that make common policy in several areas. The EU was created in 1993 with the signing of the Treaty on European Union. The EU represents the latest and most successful in a series of efforts to unify Europe, including many attempts to achieve unity through force of arms, such as those seen in the campaigns of Napoleon Bonaparte and World War II.

The fundamental issues over the EU treaty were settled at the Brussels summit, but the new prime minister will have to approve the final details. As chancellor, Gordon Brown has been more interested in practical EU policies than in institutional debates. He sees Britain's future in an EU that is adaptable, free-market and pragmatic. A study in the journal *International Affairs* in March concluded that he would be either an "awkward partner" or a "pragmatic player" but not someone who wanted to put Britain at the bleeding edge of European integration. His EU adviser is a Treasury official, John Cunliffe, who knows Mr Brown's thinking on Europe well. Mr Brown has kept Britain out of the Euro and this policy is likely to continue. Arguments ahead could come over Turkish membership, which he wants, state support for industry which the new French President Nicolas Sarkozy favours, farm policy reform and Britain's budget contributions.

Moreover, Aid and development was one area in which Gordon Brown made his mark internationally as chancellor. He has championed debt relief through the "Heavily Indebted Poor Countries" initiative. He proposed an International Finance Facility to help the poorer countries to raise capital. He supported the G8 initiative in 2005 to double aid to Africa. The UK Treasury says he will have increased the British aid budget to "nearly £6.5 billion a year by 2007-08 - a real terms increase of 140 per cent since 1997". So he can be expected to be active in these areas as prime minister. His efforts will probably be reflected in an attempt to get Britain closer to the Commonwealth.

2. The Relationship between The UK and The US

The relationship between the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (U.K.) goes back almost two hundred years before the United States declared independence from Great Britain. (Keith Porter)

Theory has an even more difficult time explaining the relationship between the United States (US) and the United Kingdom (UK). Of course, U.S. and U.K. interests were not identical, but they moved from enmity to a firm alliance often spoken of as the "special relationship", which has now largely eclipsed "Great Rapprochement" as an umbrella description of Anglo-American relations. "Great Rapprochement" describes reality but was also invented and used for political purposes. This special relationship expanded as the gap between the U.K.'s recognized interests and its power grew, in an era when the U.K. did definitely believe it had a worldwide role, now the United States has no closer ally than the United Kingdom.

First of all, American civil war, and various disputes that arose between the two nations (US and UK) during the Napoleonic wars (1803-1815), then, they quarreled about the Canadian boundary in the following decades, brought Britain and the United States to the edge of hostilities, but settled the disputes by negotiation. The last significant foreign-policy dispute between the United States and Britain occurred in 1895 over American demand that Britain submit to international arbitration with Venezuela about the western boundary of British Guiana.

In addition, during the early 1950s Anglo-American relations over the Middle and Far East were strong. But the 1956 Suez Crisis brought Anglo-American relations and co-operation to a low point. To make matters worse, Britain was unsupportive of aggressive American policies in Indochina (modern Vietnam), and only gave limited diplomatic support. So Britain became less important for American strategy in the Middle and Far East.

During the First World War, the United States gave Britain powerful financial and material assistance, without which the Allies would almost certainly have lost the war. But when the United States finally entered the fight in 1917, it joined only as an Associated Power, not a formal ally. The war thus played a double-edged role in the development of Anglo-American relations.

The relations were strengthened during both World Wars. Today the US and UK share an unprecedented relationship that has helped secure shared interests and values since the World Wars of the last century, the two nations developed unparalleled interoperability military, working together to meet the challenges of the Cold War, leading in NATO, and fighting side by side in defence of global interests. As well as at every level the British and American

defense establishments service men and women train together, learn together, developed capability together and, fight together. The two nations are bound together by a shared history, an overlap in religion and legal system.

Moreover, there is close cooperation in the areas of trade, commerce, finance, technology, academics, as well as the arts and science; the sharing of government and military intelligence and joint combat operations and peacekeeping missions carried out between the two nations. Bilateral cooperation reflects the common language, ideals, and democratic practices of the two nations. The United Kingdom and the United States continually consult on foreign policy issues and global problems and share major foreign and security policy objectives. The UK has always been the biggest foreign investor in the US and vice versa.

The “Great Rapprochement” was used at the time, and, to an extent, is still used now, to describe the closer relations between Britain and the United States that emerged in the mid-1890s. It implies that the political hostilities centered on the American Revolution were fading and that the two nations were in some sense natural friends and allies.

Finally we can say, there was, bickering and but underlying geopolitics and a common heritage continue to be inescapable. They succeeded in building so well and so fast because the foundations were already there, strong and deeply rooted. Then and now, we are indeed “bound by a tie we did not forge and which we cannot break.” Or, as Margaret Thatcher put it in an address to the Joint Houses of Congress on February 20, 1985,

Our two countries have a common heritage as well as a common Language. It is no mere figure of speech to say that many of your most enduring traditions- representative government, Habeas Corpus, trial by jury, a system of constitutional checks and balances- stem from our own small islands. But they are as much your lawful inheritance as ours. You did not borrow these traditions you took them with you, because they were already your own. (NP)

3. The UK and the EU

First of all, The United Kingdom is a member of the European Union and a major international trading power. The United Kingdom is one of the largest markets for U.S. goods exports and

one of the largest suppliers of U.S. imports. The United States and the United Kingdom share the world's largest bilateral foreign direct investment partnerships.

For decades, the United Kingdom has had an ambivalent and sometimes contentious relationship with the European Union. May be it is the long history of hostilities that clouds the British view of Europe with suspicion. As an empire builder and major trading power it was inevitable that Britain would come into conflict with rivals vying for the same territories and trade routes. And allegiances shifted. All of its main rivals - Germany in the world wars, Russia in the Cold War, and France through most of modern history - have also at times been important allies.

London has kept its distance from Brussels's authority by negotiating opt-outs from some of the EU's central policies, including the common euro currency and the border-free Schengen area. Even still, the EU's faltering response to recent crises has fueled a renewed euroscepticism. Advocates for a British exit, or Brexit, from the union argued that by reclaiming its national sovereignty, the UK would be better able to manage immigration, free itself from onerous regulations, and spark more dynamic growth. (Peter Nicholls/Reuters, NP)

On the other hand, The victory of the Leave campaign in a June 2016 referendum on the UK's future in the bloc led to tumult in financial markets and the resignation of Prime Minister David Cameron. The UK must negotiate a new relationship with the EU. With May triggering the Article 50 exit process in March 2017 and committing to leave the EU Single Market, the UK may face the loss of preferential access to its largest trading partner, the disruption of its large financial sector, a protracted period of political uncertainty, and the breakup of the UK itself. Meanwhile, Brexit could accelerate nationalist movements across the continent, from Scotland to Hungary, with unpredictable consequences for the EU. (Peter Nicholls/Reuters, NP)

The UK didn't join the EEC until 1973. The British people approved membership in a 1975 referendum, but suspicion of political union with the rest of Europe remained strong. Critics argued that the European project was already moving beyond mere economic integration and toward a European "Superstate." As integration deepened throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the UK's leaders pushed for opt-outs. The UK didn't join the single currency or the border-free Schengen area, and it negotiated a reduced budget contribution.

In addition, UK remained aloof from the continent's first postwar efforts toward integration, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the the European Economic Community (EEC), formed in the hopes of avoiding another devastating war. "We did not

enter the EU with the same political imperatives [as France and Germany],” Robin Niblett, head of the London-based think tank Chatham House, has argued. “We had not been invaded, we did not lose the war, and we have historical connections to all sorts of other parts of the world from our empire and commonwealth.” The UK didn't join the EEC until 1973. The British people approved membership in a 1975 referendum, but suspicion of political union with the rest of Europe remained strong.

More over as integration deepened throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the UK's leaders pushed for opt-outs. The UK didn't join the single currency. Many conservatives never reconciled with membership in the EU, and discontent rose in particular over immigration. The issue of migration from within the EU is fraught, as the UK is currently required to accept the free movement of EU citizens. Economic migration from Eastern Europe spiked after the EU expansions of 2004 and 2007, pushing net migration to the UK to more than three hundred thousand people a year by 2015.

This latter, in the referendum that took place on June 23, 2016, voters in the UK made a choice on the following question: “Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?”

“Leave won by 51.9% to 48.1%. The referendum turnout was 71.8%, with more than 30 million people voting, shocking the UK's political establishment. England voted for Brexit, by 53.4% to 46.6%. Wales also voted for Brexit, with Leave getting 52.5% of the vote and Remain 47.5%. Scotland and Northern Ireland both backed staying in the EU. Scotland backed Remain by 62% to 38%, while 55.8% in Northern Ireland voted Remain and 44.2% Leave. Theresa May had been against Brexit during the referendum campaign but is now in favour of it because she says it is what the British people want. Her key message has been that “Brexit means Brexit” and she triggered the two year process of leaving the EU on 29 March. She set out her negotiating goals in a letter to the EU council president Donald Tusk.” (By Alex Hunt & Brian Wheeler)

Finally, in a January 2017 speech, May confirmed that the UK will not remain in the Single Market or EU customs union after Brexit. Instead, the government will pursue a new trade agreement with the EU. That decision, combined with France's assurance that the UK will pay a “price” for leaving, has raised fears of a “hard Brexit,” in which negotiations fail to produce some sort of special arrangement within the two-year window. The UK would no doubt attempt to experiment with various revived plans for an alternative free-trade area.

Britain's relationship with the European Union has always attracted considerable comment. More recently, the possibility of Britain withdrawing from the EU- branded a Brexit - has received growing attention in the United Kingdom, the rest of the EU, and beyond. Britain's ever more strained relations with the UE have recently led commentators in both Britain and the rest of Europe to ask whether some new relationship with the UK on the outside

4. The UK interests in other countries (political and economic)

Today Britain seeks to "pursue an active and activist foreign policy, working with other countries and strengthening the rules-based international system .Retain and build up Britain's international influence in specific areas in order to shape a distinctive British foreign policy geared to the national interest."

the impact of UK trade with Europe will depend on the relationship between the UK and the UE after Brexit. In the most likely scenarios- either Swiss model, or an FTA - based relationship- regulatory divergence that adds to the cost of trade is likely to increase over time.Damaging bilateral trade volumes and the UK's position in European supply chains.The costs will be borne by consumers s well as businesses.

The UK intends to continue a strong, close and frank relationship with the United States that delivers concrete benefits for both sides, and to advance the British national interest through an effective EU policy in priority areas, engaging constructively while protecting national sovereignty. The UK seeks to deliver more effective and modernised international institutions, particularly the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, the European Union, the United Nations, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Council of Europe. In addition, it was working to strengthen the Commonwealth as a focus for promoting democratic values, human rights, climate resilient development, conflict prevention and trade; while using soft power as a tool of UK foreign policy; promote British values, including human rights; and contribute to the welfare of developing countries and their citizens.

Britain is home to the world's largest foreign exchange market, its biggest insurance market and one of the two largest centres in the world for fund management and international legal services. The UK is at the heart of the world's largest single market, ranked the easiest place in Europe to do business and the number one location for European headquarters.

“By 2011 Britain was consciously shifting UK diplomatic weight to the East and to the South; to the economic titans and emerging economies of Latin America, the Gulf and of Asia, where it have not been as active in recent years as circumstances warranted. These are the markets of

the future, and as the old club of so-called developed nations gives way to a wider circle of international decision-making, they may also come to hold the balance of influence in international affairs. Britain must pursue a distinctive British foreign policy that is aligned with Britain's other national interests and geared to security and prosperity. This requires Britain to look East as never before, to new sources of opportunity and prosperity and for solutions to threats to our security".

Britain was not turning away from Europe or from the indispensable alliance with the United States. America will remain our single closest ally. Britain will support its enlargement, the effective use of its collective weight in the world, the strengthening of its single market, and proposals to promote economic growth.

5. Conclusion

By conclude, this last part of my dissertation has certainly required making efforts as it has been entirely practical, the greatest challenge for the new government is to establish some guiding principles for a new global strategy . This will be particularly difficult.

The impact of Brexit on British bussiness, the UK economy and wider British interests would be serve and felt across multiple channels. Both the path and the endpoint, in terms of the new relationship between the UK and the rest of the EU, would be uncertain, compounding the costs to the UK, all Member states would, however feel the impact of Brexit, both politically and economically .

Finally, Brexit would have a wider political impact on the EU both by disrupting internal political dynamics.

General conclusion:

To sum up, this dissertation provides an historical, political, and socio-economic framework for understanding British history and politics in the 20th and 21st centuries. The relationship between the Great Britain and the European Union had been changed, when the European Union started, its aim was to have common economic policies, and this developed into an important continental institution with a parliament, constitution, and even a court.

However, Great Britain remained fearful this institution and its influence on its economy. After attempts to face it, and to meet opposition from its members, finally, it became a member.

With the coming of Margaret Thatcher to power, this relationship got worse. Indeed, it was imperious in the different events such as financial issues, the Westland Affair and the Bruges speech.

Still Europe was the reason behind the fall of Margaret Thatcher and the end of her British opposition to Europe.

Britain's relationship with the European Union has always attracted considerable comment, More recently, the possibility of Britain withdrawing from the EU branded as Brexit.

In addition, a referendum on Brexit is now certain. while the outcome is far from a foregone conclusion, a vote for Britain to leave the EU is very possible. Brexit would have a wider political impact on the EU both by disrupting internal political dynamics and because of the risk of political contagion.

Following Brexit, the question of what is Britain's role in the world? has come into sharper focus than at any point in decades. The truth is that this question cannot be answered with any finality because it is one that depends on so many variables.

Finally, all Member states would, however feel the impact of Brexit, both politically and economically

