

RESEARCH PAPER

POST WAR US AND BRITISH FOREIGN POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sr.no	CONTENTS	Pg.no
1	Introduction	4-6
2	Background	6-9
3	Problem Statement	9
4	Analysis	9-13
5	Conclusion	14

ABSTRACT

Initially, British foreign policy concentrated on achieving a balance of influence within Europe, with no nation achieving control over the continent's affairs. For Britain's wars against Napoleon, and for British participation in the First and Second World Wars, this strategy remained a significant excuse. The United States was usually driven by containment in the years following World War II-the tactic of preventing communism from expanding outside the countries still under its control. The strategy extended to a world split between the United States and the Soviet Union by the Cold War, a struggle.

1. INTRODUCTION

British-American relations, also known as Anglo-American relations, have several dynamic partnerships, spanning from two early wars to international market rivalry. Both nations have enjoyed the unique partnership established as wartime allies and NATO partners since 1940 as close military allies.

At the beginning of the 21st century, Britain reiterated its alliance with the United States in the new British foreign policy as its "most important bilateral partnership" and American foreign policy still affirms its relationship with Britain as its most important relationship, as demonstrated by allied diplomatic affairs, reciprocal engagement in commerce, trade, finance, technology Intelligence and joint military activities and peacekeeping efforts between the armed forces of the United States and the British Armed Forces. Historically, Canada has been the biggest importer of U.S. products and the United States' primary exporter of goods. The UK was fifth in terms of exports and seventh in terms of importation of products as of January 2015.

The two countries also have had a significant impact on the cultures of many other countries. With a total population of just under 400 million in 2019, they are the two major nodes of the Anglosphere. Together, in many sectors of the western world, they have given the English language a dominating role.

Us Post War Foreign Policy (Policy of Containment)

Containment was a tactic of the United States that used various tactics to discourage communism from spreading abroad. This strategy, a part of the Cold War, was a reaction to a series of attempts by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe, China, Korea, and Vietnam to expand its communist sphere of influence.

A middle-ground position between détente and rollback was portrayed.

The United States ambassador, George F. Kennan, expressed the basis of the doctrine in a 1946 cable. The term emerged as a summary of U.S. foreign policy in a study Kennan submitted to the U.S. Secretary of Defense in 1947, a report that was later included in a magazine story.

The term containment is most closely correlated with the policies of President Harry Truman of the United States (1945–53), including the formation of a mutual security pact, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). While President Dwight Eisenhower (1953-61) was toying with the rival rollback doctrine, he declined to participate in the 1956 Hungarian revolt.

As a reason for his policies in Vietnam, President Lyndon Johnson (1963–69) invoked containment. Richard Nixon, President (1969–74), Acting with Henry Kissinger, his top adviser, he opposed containment in favor of good relations with the Soviet Union and China. Tensions involved expanded trade and cultural contacts.

President Jimmy Carter (1976-81) stressed civil rights rather than anti-communism, but after the Soviets occupied Afghanistan in 1979, he dropped détente and resorted to containment. In Nicaragua and Afghanistan, President Ronald Reagan (1981-89), who criticized the Soviet state as a "evil empire," exacerbated the Cold War and encouraged rollback. Also, after the war's end, key systems begun under containment, including NATO and nuclear deterrence, remained in place the term containment is most closely correlated with the policies of President Harry Truman of the United States (1945–53), including the formation of a mutual security pact, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). While President

Dwight Eisenhower (1953-61) was toying with the rival rollback doctrine, he declined to participate in the 1956 Hungarian revolt. As a reason for his policies in Vietnam, President Lyndon Johnson (1963–69) invoked containment. Richard Nixon, President (1969-74), working with his top advisor Henry Kissinger, rejected containment in favor of friendly relations with the Soviet Union and China; this détente, or relaxation of tensions, involved expanded trade and cultural contacts.

British Post War Foreign Policy

It joined the European Economic Community in 1973 following years of tension with France, and gradually transformed into the European Union twenty years later by the Treaty of Maastricht.

Unlike, other European countries, the UK does not use the Euro as its currency and is not a member of the Eurozone. The United Kingdom was sometimes referred to as a "peculiar" member during the years of its membership of the European Union, leading to its periodic policy conflicts with the United Kingdom Association. The United Kingdom has stayed out of EU laws and policies on a regular basis. Global opinion polls have shown that of the 28 nationalities in the European Union, British citizens historically feel the least European through variations in geography, tradition, and history., British people have historically felt the least European. On 23 June 2016, the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union and formally left on 31 January 2020.

Although both governments also have close relationships with many other nations, the level of cooperation between the U.K. and the U.S. in trade and commerce, military planning, execution of military operations, nuclear weapons technology, and intelligence sharing has been described as "unparalleled" among major worlds.

William Wallace argues that the transformation of the European international order since 1989 has fundamentally altered the context within which British foreign policy must be conducted. Behind these rapid changes in Britain's political and security environment, more gradual technological and economic changes have further undermined the assumptions on which British foreign policy has rested. Social and economic change has also been altering the character and cohesion of the British state which foreign policy is intended to serve. The British Government, continuing to put substantial ministerial time and public expenditure into national foreign and defense policies, now has to persuade its audiences both within Britain and outside that it still has a distinctive perspective towards shared security and economic problems.

2. BACKGROUND

Us Foreign Policy Historical Perspective

The political stance was isolationism and non-interventionism for the first 200 years of United States history. "The farewell address of George Washington is often cited as laying the foundation for a tradition of American non-interventionism: "For us, in relation to foreign nations, the great rule of conduct is to expand our trade ties, to have as little diplomatic connection with them as possible. Europe has a collection of primary desires, none of which we have, or a very distant relationship. She may also be interested in numerous scandals whose roots are fundamentally alien to our interests. Therefore, it would be unwise for us to include ourselves in the usual vicissitudes of her affairs, or the ordinary variations and clashes of her alliances or enmities, by artificial relations.

- **Non-interventionism continued throughout the nineteenth century**

Since the January Rebellion of 1863 in Poland was put down by Tsar Alexander II, the French Emperor Napoleon III asked the United States to "join the Tsar's protest." Secretary of State William H Seward refused to "defend our non-intervention policy, straight, absolute, and peculiar as it may seem to other nations," and maintained that "the American people must be content to recommend the cause of human progress through the wisdom with which they should

exercise self-government powers.", Forbearance from international alliances, invasion, and involvement at all times, and in any manner.”

- **Non-Interventionism between the World Wars**

The non-interventionist trends in U.S. foreign policy were in full effect in the aftermath of the First World War. Next, the United States Congress opposed the most cherished condition of the Versailles Convention, the League of Nations, through President Woodrow Wilson. Many Americans believed like they did not need the rest of the world to make their own decisions on peace, and that they were perfect. While "anti-League" was the policy of the government, the League of Nations was either sponsored or watched by private citizens and lower diplomats. This quasi-isolationism indicates that the United States was engaged in international relations but was fearful that it would sacrifice the freedom to behave on foreign policy as it pleased by pledging full support for the League.

British Foreign Policy Historical Perspective

In the time between the end of the French Wars and the death of British foreign policy, a variety of consistent priorities and strategies can be found in British Foreign Policy.

Palmerston: 1815 to 1865. These principles are as follows:

- **Maintenance of The Peace in Europe**

In the time between the end of the French Wars and the death of Lord Palmerston, a variety of consistent goals and priorities can be found in British Foreign Policy: 1815 to 1865. The following are these principles:

- **The Maintenance of Harmony in Europe**

On the part of Britain, this was not altruism but the product of serious factors. In all of Britain and even in Europe, there was a great 'war-weariness.' For twenty-two years, the French Wars continued, and during that period,

The French were only consistently opposed by Britain. The French Forces had conquered other European nations and/or concluded peace treaties with them. The citizens of Britain recalled the sacrifice that the nation had made during the French Wars; the wars had cost £ 600 million for Britain. Other factors relevant to the economic condition of Britain, and even more important, Britain depended on trade for survival. Her colonies provided raw materials and a ready market for Britain's manufactures, invisible earnings banking and insurance provided vast amounts of incoming cash. In wartime, these things eventually suffered, but Britain decided to see that the first weapon used was diplomacy. Britain was the 'Workshop of the

World' after 1830, requiring raw materials to sustain its increasing factories and finished goods markets. She wanted reliable shipping routes as well. Palmerston said that he desired stability and prestige; he used 'gun-boat diplomacy' as a last resort to justify the status of Britain and prevent a more dangerous situation.

- **Maintenance of The Balance of Power in Europe**

To avoid the dominance of Europe by any one power, Britain adopted this idea. Multiple nations have dominated Europe in the past and at different times: Spain, France, and Austria-Hungary in particular. The Treaty of Paris in 1815 and the compromise reached at the Vienna Congress meant that the French Wars did not produce any clear winners or losers. Britain wanted to uphold the 1815 status quo. Britain wanted to hedge parliamentary structures against autocracies as well. More territory in Europe was ruled by autocratic rulers in 1815 than by constitutionalists, so Britain promoted the spread of constitutionalism wherever possible, particularly in coastal countries: Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Greece. [A 'littoral' country is one that has a coastline]

- **Cautious Containment of France**

By cooperating with the other powers, Britain decided to contain France. In 1815, this was a priority and was a strategy that all other European nations shared. Under Palmerston, who refused to see the rise of Prussia, it later became a British bias. If it was diplomatic, colonial or by influence, Britain was almost paranoid about future French expansionism. Britain sought to keep France within its walls because France was perceived as the most threatening country in the world. This approach towards France was very narrow and sustained for way too long: The Foreign Office was practically oblivious to the rise of Prussia around 1850, which posed a greater danger to Europe's peace and prosperity than to France. Bismarck and Prussia were willing to hoodwink Britain diplomatically.

- **A Policy of Cautious Colonial Expansion**

This was a case of being 'in tune' with the Department of Trade by the Foreign Office. Imperialism has heavy overtones in ideology and politics as reasons for the conquest of territories, such as the 'Scramble for Africa'. There has been no mention of 'British imperialism' yet. The early nineteenth century saw the rise of British overseas possessions for bases and markets or, by the expansion of trade, as an extension of control, for example in South Africa or the Far East. Britain had to extend the British goods markets and also to create more raw material supplies.

- **A Consciously Naval Policy**

The navy was the trump card of Britain and the Royal Navy dominated foreign affairs. In places the navy could cover, British influence and prestige were greatest. Sometimes, the use of the navy can be calculated by British performance in diplomacy. Sea control was very important, and the right hand of the Foreign Office was the Royal Navy, albeit secondary to diplomacy: it was not inherently offensive to use the navy.

- **Maintaining the Integrity of The Turkish Empire**

This was 'part and parcel' of the rising vulnerability of Britain to Russia and included restricting Russian ambitions to spread into the Ottoman Empire. Supporting the Sultan, though, runs the risk of raising a frail, dependent Turkey. In the nineteenth century, the sensitivity of Britain over the Eastern Issue increased because India became more important, particularly for cotton products. It was necessary to secure Britain's trading routes: the Suez Canal was not opened until 1869. As competing objectives between Britain and Russia increased, the possibility of animosity also grew. The 1815 relationship degenerated into the enmity of 1853.

3. PROBLEM STATEMENT

" Analyzing the United states and British foreign policy in the aftermath of world War two (post war) scenario."

4. ANALYSIS

Us Foreign Policy Success or Failure

The American response to the expansion of communism and the influence of the Soviet Union was the containment policy. The term was coined by State Department staffer George Kennan and was based on the premise that the United States must apply counterforce to any aggressive moves by the Soviet Union. This policy was reflected in the creation of a network of political and military alliances, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), and the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). Both the Truman Doctrine (1947), which committed the United States to protect "free peoples" in Europe from attack, and the Korean War (1950-1953) are examples of containment in practice. American policy also recognized the importance of economic assistance to prevent communism from gaining support. Under the Marshall Plan, named for Secretary of State George C. Marshall, the United States pumped billions of dollars into Western Europe to help

with reconstruction after World War II. Foreign aid, direct financial aid to countries around the world for both economic and military development, became a key element of American diplomacy.

U.S. foreign policy was also guided by the domino theory, the thought that if one country in a region came under communist control, other nations in the area would soon follow. It was the reason the United States became involved in Vietnam, which ultimately cost 58,000 American lives, many billions of dollars, and a bitterly divided country.

The Cold War was punctuated by periods of thaw in U.S.-Soviet relations. Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson met with the leaders of the Soviet Union in what was known as summit diplomacy. The 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which was negotiated in the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis (October 1962), was one of the positive results of these meetings.

Talking about successes, in nearly all these successful cases, the United States recognized the limits to U.S. leverage and adjusted its original goals to win international support and eventually reach mutually beneficial agreements. An obvious case in point is the recent nuclear deal between the P5+1 countries and Iran. If the United States insisted that Iran give up its entire program and refused to talk to Tehran directly, it made no headway whatsoever, and the Islamic Republic just kept building more and more capacity and enriching more and more uranium. Once the United States came to its senses and began to negotiate in earnest, however, it was able to assemble a more effective international coalition and eventually reach a deal that will prevent Iran from moving closer to a bomb for at least a decade. It did not hurt that Iran's citizens elected a more reasonable government, of course, but it took flexibility on America's part to take advantage of that opportunity.

Success also involved a willingness to work with authoritarian regimes whose values and governing principles differed from America's, instead of imposing a lot of onerous preconditions before getting down to serious talks. The United States did not demand that states become democracies before joining the Proliferation Security Initiative or receiving Nunn-Lugar funds, and the Trans-Pacific Partnership currently being finalized includes friendly democracies such as Australia and one-party regimes such as Vietnam (and the sultanate of Brunei, too). I like democracy as much as anyone but making it a precondition for deal-making is bad diplomacy and bad for business too.

Finally, these achievements all involved situations in which the participants had ample incentive to reach solutions that would leave them all better off. Iran has good reasons to want

to get out of the “penalty box” that it has been in for the past 20-plus years, and the P5+1 country (and other nearby states) will be better off with Iran’s path to a nuclear weapon blocked. Similarly, reopening relations with Cuba will yield tangible economic benefits for Cuba’s struggling economy, but will also do more to accelerate an end to dictatorship there than the failed policies of the past 50 years. Trade deals with Asia and Europe will also have positive economic and strategic effects, even though U.S. negotiators are hardly going to get everything they might have wanted.

- **Détente and The End of the Cold War**

During the late 1950s and early 60s both European alliance systems began to weaken somewhat; in the Western bloc, France began to explore closer relations with Eastern Europe and the possibility of withdrawing its forces from NATO. In the Soviet bloc, Romania took the lead in departing from Soviet policy. U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War in Southeast Asia led to additional conflict with some of its European allies and diverted its attention from the cold war in Europe. All these factors combined to loosen the rigid pattern of international relationships and resulted in a period of detente.

In the 1980s, U.S. President Ronald Reagan revived cold-war policies and rhetoric, referring to the Soviet Union as the evil empire and escalating the nuclear arms race; some have argued this stance was responsible for the eventual collapse of Soviet Communism while others attribute its downfall to the inherent weakness of the Soviet state and the policies of Mikhail Gorbachev. From 1989 to 1991 the cold war came to an end with the opening of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of Communist party dictatorship in Eastern Europe, the reunification of Germany, and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. In the 21st cent., however, the revival, under Vladimir Putin, of Russia's military power and great power ambitions led to new geopolitical tensions and conflicts between Russia and the West, and the economic and military modernization of China (which remained ruled by the Communist party) also resulted in tensions and conflicts, especially with respect to Chinese claims in the South China Sea.

American foreign policy took a new direction during the 1970s. Under President Richard Nixon, détente, an easing of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, led to increased trade and cultural exchanges and, most important, to an agreement to limit nuclear weapons the 1972 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I). In the same year, Nixon began the process of normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China.

Superpower rivalry continued for a time, however. The Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan resulted in an American-led boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics. President Reagan actively

supported anti-communist, anti-left-wing forces in both Nicaragua and El Salvador, which he considered client states of the Soviet Union (the "evil empire"). He increased American defense spending significantly during his first term. The Soviet Union simply could not match these expenditures. Faced with a serious economic crisis, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev instituted new policies called glasnost (openness) and perestroika (economic restructuring) that eased tensions with the United States. By the early 1990s, the Cold War had effectively come to an end. The Soviet Union ceased to exist with the independence of the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania), Ukraine, Belarus, Armenia, Georgia, and the Central Asian republics.

- **The New World Order**

The collapse of the Soviet Union did not mean an end to conflict around the world. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990 prompted the United States to put together an international coalition under the auspices of the United Nations (UN) that culminated in the brief Persian Gulf War in 1991. Both the UN and NATO were involved in seeking a resolution to the ethnic conflict in the former Yugoslavia. While the United States arranged a settlement in the region known as the Dayton Accords (1995), it did not prevent a new outbreak of fighting between Serbs and ethnic Albanians in the province of Kosovo. NATO aircraft bombed targets in Serbia, including the capital Belgrade, in response. This was the first time that NATO forces conducted combat operations in Europe.

- **Success or Failure?**

This containment policy was effective in preventing the spread of communism. The Cold War was called so as it technically never heated up into a direct USSR US war, however the US's containment policy put these two powers at odds through a series of outside conflicts in several theaters internationally.

British Foreign Policy Analysis

While Britain took the backseat in the Cold War, which was largely fought between the US and the Soviet Union, it still played a pretty significant role in the way things went down. This is hardly surprising, seeing as the UK and Russia have a long history of rivalry based on ideological differences.

Although UK Prime Minister Winston Churchill had initially worked with Soviet Union leader Joseph Stalin towards the end of WWII to eradicate the Nazis and rebuild Europe, this relationship quickly crumbled. In the aftermath of the war, Churchill adopted a vehemently anti-Communist stance that saw him cooperate with US President Franklin D. Roosevelt and

his successor, Harry Truman. By 1946, the pretense of having any civilized relationship with the Soviets was up; Churchill's "Iron Curtain" speech condemned the Soviet Union's policies in Europe on 5 March. The speech is largely seen as the most famous oration of the Cold War period, even though Churchill had been voted out as PM by this point.

Churchill's speech is particularly significant as it had a massive influence on the Truman Doctrine, and later the Marshall Plan, which served to further solidify the UK's relationship with the US, thus creating a united front against the Soviet Union and the Communism it championed. Therefore, there is a strong argument for the notion that Britain played a key role in developing ideas that led to key events in the Cold War.

That is all you need to know in terms of the UK's indirect influence on the Cold War for now. Directly speaking, however, Britain made a few significant attempts to prevent the spread of Soviet power. Should you want to know, British troops were sent to Greece in 1946 to prevent a Communist seizure of power immediately after WWII. This happened because many of the resistance movements in Nazi-occupied countries had been Communist and they represented a political force in the immediate post-war world. Unfortunately, Britain could not afford to support the fighting against Communists in Greece, and the task was taken over by the United States. This is a comment on the changing roles of the US and the UK as world peacekeepers but goes to show that the UK was active in the Cold War. The objective elements of British power are still unchanged, keeping Brexit in mind. These include formal membership of international organizations such as the UN, the G7 and NATO, intelligence sharing arrangements (such as membership of the "five eyes" group), the Commonwealth and a broader network of strong alliances across the world. We have world class diplomatic and security services. In recent times, moreover, we have signaled our intent to keep investing in these assets. In July 2015, for example, the Government committed the UK to meeting the spending target of 2% of GDP required by NATO countries, for the next five years. The Government also guaranteed a real increase in the defense budget every year, until it reached £47.7 billion a year by 2020. This means that there are firm foundations to our foreign and national security policy

CONCLUSION

Western bloc and their collective efforts against the Soviets (The Marshall plan, Truman's doctrine) were solid enough to contain the threat of communism in the world. But not everyone agrees the end of communism was the result of the United States' deep pockets. Some historians assert that the USSR had lived its natural life span and the U.S. was merely a witness to its death.

REFERENCES

- Kissinger, Henry, and Vera Wellings. *American foreign policy*. Royal Victorian Institute for the Blind Tertiary Resource Service., 1977.
- Otte, Thomas G. *The Foreign Office Mind: The Making of British Foreign Policy, 1865–1914*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Wilson, James Q., John J. DiIulio Jr, Meena Bose, and Matthew S. Levendusky. *American government: Institutions and policies*. Cengage Learning, 2018.
- Deighton, Anne. *Britain and the Cold War*. Springer, 2016.
- Sanders, David, and David Patrick Houghton. *Losing an empire, finding a role: British foreign policy since 1945*. Macmillan International Higher Education, 2016.
- Wallace, William. "The collapse of British foreign policy." *International affairs* 81, no. 1 (2005): 53-68.