

GLOBAL ACADEMIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE

COLOMBO, SRI LANKA



GARI International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

ISSN 2659-2193

Volume: 07 | Issue: 01

On 28th February 2021

<http://www.research.lk>

Author: Sandesha Perera

University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka

GARI Publisher | Foreign Policy | Volume: 07 | Issue: 01

Article ID: IN/GARI/ICSSH/2020/139 | Pages: 94-105 (12)

ISSN 2659-2193 | Edit: GARI Editorial Team

Received: 14.12.2020 | Publish: 28.02.2021

THE EVOLUTION OF THE BRITISH- EU FOREIGN POLICY

Sandesh Perera

sandesh@kln.ac.lk

ABSTRACT

The relationship between the European Union and Britain goes back to the time where the initiative was taken in forming the European Union. Over time, the British - EU relations have been a rough ride due to the ideological disputes among the leaders of the nations involved. Britain has rarely played a smooth part in European integration, earning the description of “an awkward partner” and in recent years Britain has gone further, becoming a dysfunctional and destructive partner. Not a day seems to pass without Britain’s domestic politics causing problems for the rest of the EU. Therefore, the main objective of this paper is to analyze the evolution of the British-EU foreign policy overtime under the specific British Prime Minister since the establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) of the EU until the 2016 BREXIT referendum. The study is based on qualitative research using secondary data to get an in-depth understanding of the discussed phenomenon. Hence, the research adopts the method of content analysis to achieve the research objective. British officials’ attitude towards the CFSP has been extremely argumentative from one tenure to the other. In exploring the consensus of the officials towards the CFSP, it can be divided into periods according to the specific leader. Through the findings, it can be emphasized that the British leaders focused mostly on the leadership role and achieving their foreign policy objectives rather than institution building. Thus, it can be identified that since past Britain’s main intention has been to emerge as an

internationally powerful state together with the help of the US rather than making a change in the European region which ultimately led to BREXIT as well.

Keywords: Britain, EU, Foreign Policy, BREXIT

INTRODUCTION

The European Union (EU) integration is one of the most unique forms of integration in the international system that has taken place so far. This integration process has been able to bring together millions of Europeans to one center which shares common values on social, economic, cultural, monetary, and political aspects. The most important factor is the ability of this region to have its own currency for transactions making the trade and wealth sharing among member countries more practical and relaxed. The most important factor is that while achieving the utmost level of integration, the member states are able to maintain their own authority and democratic values within their borders while being controlled by a supranational body.

The relationship between the European Union and the United Kingdom goes back to the time where the initiative was taken in forming the European Union. Over time, the EU-UK relationship has been a rough ride due to the ideological disputes among the leaders of the nations involved. Britain has rarely played a smooth part in European integration, earning the description of “an awkward partner”. Some in the rest of the European Union

could be forgiven for thinking that in recent years Britain has gone further, becoming a dysfunctional and destructive partner. Not a day seems to pass without Britain's domestic politics causing problems for the rest of the EU. Therefore, my research problem is to assess what kind of relationship EU and Britain had from the beginning of CFSP until BREXIT. Thus, the main objective of this study is to discuss the evolution of the EU paying attention to the EU-UK foreign policy relationship over time, beginning from the establishment of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) until 2016 BREXIT referendum.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The term 'Region' is used with different implications by different scholars. Different scholars have developed different theories, different definitions, and different criteria for the concept of region. As per the Encyclopædia Britannica definition, a Region is a cohesive area that is homogeneous in selected defining criteria and is distinguished from neighboring areas or regions by those criteria. Basically, in a region, the states are similar in characteristics compared to other regions.

Nye (1968) defined an international region "as a limited number of states linked by a geographical relationship and by a degree of mutual interdependence." As per Nye's definition of the region, the states in a region wish to be interdependent for the smooth functioning of their affairs. Soderbaum (2008) as per the constructivist idea of regionalism, there are no natural regions, all regions are heterogeneous with unclear territorial margins. Therefore, the regions are socially constructed and politically contested which emphasizes the fact that political actors play the main role in the process of region forming. Regions can be categorized into two types following their

contexts. In the societal context, a unit means a nation, and the region is the set of adjacent nations. While in the political context, a unit is identified with state and region means, a spatially coherent territory composed of two or more states (Buzan, 1998).

Defining the concept of "region" is done through physical, political, and economic criteria without embarking on theory development. Mansfield and Milner (1997) emphasize geographical proximity and specificity as the key defining traits of a region. The concept of the region evolved historically to mean a space between the national and the local within a particular state which means a micro-region. The concept of region is used to refer to macro-regions which are larger territorial units. They exist between the state level and the global system level. The macro-region has been the most common object of analysis in international relations, while micro-regions have more commonly been considered in the study of domestic politics. (Soderbaum, 2011)

The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP)

Since its formation, the European Communities have relied not only on the development of economic links between their Member States but also on the establishment of respect and recognition among the Member States and the outside world. If the European Union is to become a leading power in foreign relations, the economic impact of the world must be complemented by strong security capabilities. The Member States of the EU have been cooperating in the field of foreign policy for decades, well beyond the framework of the Community Treaties. Six Member States founded the European Political Cooperation (EPC) in 1970 through the Luxembourg Report, which was then formally adopted by foreign ministers within the European Council. The EPC was purely an intergovernmental mechanism by which the Member States

agreed to collaborate in the field of foreign policy by periodically consulting each other and harmonizing their views, where possible, and by setting up joint measures. The EPC took place entirely outside the institutions of the Community as an intergovernmental mechanism and was intended to unify Europe politically, as distinct from economic unification.

The Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) was established as one of the three pillars of the EU by the Treaty of European Union or best known as the Maastricht Treaty of 1992. The Treaty outlines the principles of the CFSP, such as safeguarding common values, fundamental interests, unity and independence of the EU, strengthening the security of the Union in all ways, preserving peace and strengthening international security, as well as the development of democracy and the rule of law, respecting the human rights and fundamental freedoms. In achieving these objectives, the EU had to use many techniques namely, the adoption of common strategies, the performance of joint actions, adoption of common positions, and deepening cooperation in the field of foreign policy between the member states (Galstyan, 2010).

In contrast to the first pillar of the EU, where they focused only on economic cooperation within the European Community, the CFSP is an intergovernmental forum where the states integrate their foreign and defense policies to one center. This is quite a great step in the integration process since integration in such sensitive areas was not achieved in the international system within the states. In order to make the functions of the CFSP more effective, in 1999 High Representatives were appointed by the European Council. The Treaty of Lisbon made drastic changes in 2009 introducing High Representatives for the Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and the new permanent President of the European

Council also established the European External Action Service (EEAS) and made progress to the Common Security and Defense Policy (CSDP) which is an important part of the CFSP.

Once the creation of the CFSP was mentioned there were many debates concerning the integration in security aspect as the world visualized integrating into the defense aspect as establishing a European armed force with the aim to militarize Europe. Yet, the EU dismissed the doubts mentioning the fact that the CFSP is not a military agreement and NATO will continue playing that role about collective security and the CFSP will not affect the member states' individual defense policies (Duquette, 2001).

The CFSP's sphere is quite far-reaching as it includes all areas of foreign and security policies of the states within the region. The objective of the CFSP is to make sure that the EU speaks in one voice when it comes to foreign policy or security-related issues. The member states must adopt and ratify the decisions taken by the EU according to their constitutional requirements. The concept of the Member States that a genuinely shared foreign policy could ever exist could have been an aspiration supported by ambition rather than real intent. Unlike the first pillar, intergovernmental cooperation between the second and third pillars is largely formalized. Critics claim that, while the CFSP has a changed institutional and legal structure, it still lacks the power to impact because the performance of the CFSP depends solely on the political will of the individual Member States because they have declined to grant the supranational status to the CFSP. Indeed, it was necessary for the Member States that the supranational status of the CFSP be granted by the Member States. It was crucial for the Member States that their right to conduct national defense remained relatively intact. Therefore, the Group and

the CFSP function as entirely separate actors, similar to the arrangement of the EPC system, but with a common legal framework.

In the creation and implementation process of the CFSP, many EU bodies with various authorities are involved. Yet, the CFSP is not implemented in the usual way as other policy areas as foreign policy and security are the core of state sovereignty.

Therefore, the political guidance and decision-making procedure are driven by the highest level of governments within the member states. The European Council, therefore, determines the CFSP's goals and core principles and accepts common strategies. Joint acts and traditional roles relevant to the realms of the CFSP are adopted by the EU Council of Ministers, whose execution is often considered to be the responsibility of the Presidency. Foundations for joint activities are given by the European Commission. In the strategic and legislative decision-making processes of the CFSP, the presidency of the Council plays a significant role in coordinating the activities of the institutions. It is assisted by the Secretariat and the Secretary of the Council/High Representative to the CFSP on these matters. The European Parliament is regularly updated on developments in the area of the CSFP and expresses its opinion on focal occasions.

Thus, the establishment, evolution, role, and implementation of the European Common Foreign and Security Policy can be set forth. It is believed that the CFSP would let the European countries stand alone in the international system collectively without being shadowed by other powerful states in the international system. Yet, doubts concerning the CFSP still exist concerning the security policies as there's a possibility of NATO influence the CFSP. Also, from the foreign policy perspective, states in the present international system due to the power

struggle are quite hesitant to compromise their foreign policy and sovereignty with others.

Foreign Policies of EU Member States

The EU member states have gotten into the agreement in having a unique framework to create a collective foreign, security, and defense policy. Through this initiative, the EU and the EU members have been able to create a significant international profile. Developing a collective foreign policy has been challenging as member states themselves have their foreign policies to deal with. At the initiation, the main aim was to get a concise knowledge of the member states' foreign policies. Yet, there was a tension between the national foreign policies and the Europeanized foreign policies which over time the EU and the member states have been able to create the tension into a positive result through their foreign policy objectives. The integration of national and Europeanized foreign policy was quite challenging as it had to balance the nations' attitudes, interests, and most importantly sovereignty without any prejudice from external parties. Therefore, the EU had to manage its collective interests while protecting the individual interest of the nations as well.

Manners and Whitman (2000) mentions that the EU foreign policymaking is made by predominant duality which emphasizes policymaking and diplomatic and institutional structures. Regarding policymaking, it is largely managed at the national level. The EU foreign policy is largely woven around the national interests of its member states namely, security, defense, energy security, and migration. Besides, diplomatic and institutional structures have set out well-integrated policies across Europe on trade, climate change, freedom, security, and justice. Through both these aspects, the common European strategy is created.

Interestingly, EU membership is created geopolitically and institutionally through collective policymaking. The European Council, as a non-Community institution, is excluded from the Union's everyday operations, but its powerful composition means that the CFSP's strategic direction and decision-making leadership comes from the highest ranks in each Member State.

The widely held norm in EU foreign policy falls between the state-centric approach and institution-derived external affairs (Manners and Whitman, 2000). It has been quite a debate in identifying the role of the EU in the international system. The EU enlargement policy through time has widened the geopolitical cooperation and institutionalization. While the Council of the European Union operates under the overall leadership of the European Council, the regular operations of the Common Foreign and Security Policy are the responsibility of the Council itself. It is empowered, by shared positions and joint measures to identify and enforce the CFSP and to propose common policies to the European Council. It is also obliged to ensure the 'unity, continuity, and efficacy' of the Union's actions.

The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom consists of Great Britain, Wales, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. Both Great Britain and Northern Ireland played a vital role in the process of economic integration from the concept of the Free Trade Area to the European Common Market leading to the European Community. Starting from the Economic Union today European Union plays the role of an Economic and Monetary Union. Yet, until the point of BREXIT, UK has been remaining outside the Economic and Monetary Union showing a great reluctance to accept Euro as the common currency and remaining to use Sterling Pounds as their main currency. It can be mentioned that the UK did not fully enter the European integration process through

the Economic and Monetary Union due to historical, geographical, political, and economic, and socio-cultural reasons (Holmes, 2001).

According to Her Majesty's document (2013), within the EU, the UK is among the Big 3 members alongside France and Germany. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the UK possesses a strong diplomatic and military capacity in the EU. The UK plays a vital role in the EU while being one of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, being a member of both G8 and G20 groups, and most importantly as a founding member of NATO. In addition to that among the EU members, Britain maintains one of the most extensive diplomatic networks increasing its embassies worldwide. Together with that, UK utilizes its soft power in the world to influence the nations utilizing its language and culture through Commonwealth programs and the British Council. UK identifies itself as the mediator between the EU- US relations. The UK also works towards making the budding EU strategies a reality. Another major step taken by the UK is engaging in the Strategic Defense and Security Review (SDSR) and the National Security Strategy (NSS). Through these actions, it is visible that the UK sought a global role where the UK can make an influence on the world, rather than being confined to a regional organization (Maziere, 2013). This is one of the main reasons for the concept of leaving the EU, which will indirectly affect the architecture and priorities within the EU as the US has specifically mentioned that if the UK leaves the EU, it will make a severe impact on the EU-US relationship as they lack the voice of UK in the discussions (Gordon, 2013).

The BREXIT procedure will indefinitely prejudice and have an impact on the UK- Ireland relationship as well since the UK is the most important trading

partner of Ireland given the fact that they also enjoy a passport-free common travel area. Once the UK withdraws from the EU, all the bilateral agreements as such will be prejudiced. Anglo-French defense relationship's foundation stone was also laid to have a collective defense policy between UK and France. Yet, given the situation, that effort will be futile if the UK leaves the EU (Moller and Oliver, 2014).

So far, the main objective of the UK's foreign policy has been to promote and enlighten the national interest of the state while protecting freedom, fairness, and responsibility. Britain should extend its global possibilities through the network of diplomats in a networked world. The UK wishes to strengthen its bilateral and multilateral relations among nations emphasizing promoting and protecting their culture together with human rights. Among these objectives, priority is given to safeguarding UK's national interest and security, building its prosperity, and supporting UK nationals around the world.

METHODOLOGY

The study is based on qualitative research which is aimed at gathering an in-depth understanding of the discussed phenomenon. Hence, the research adopts the method of content analysis to analyse the research problem. The qualitative secondary data were retrieved from books, online journals, e-books, and articles on the subject available on the internet. In order to analyze the collected data, most importantly, a review of the already collected literature will be conducted to identify what kind of a relationship UK and EU have had so far under each Prime Minister since the inception of the CFSP. Through analysing each prime Minister's tenure, it would be evident how they handled their foreign relations with the EU and what their main objectives were within their national interest.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The political leadership of British foreign policy is officially exercised by the Foreign Secretary as head of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). The effectiveness of the Foreign Secretary depends on the Foreign Secretary's relationship with the PM and his interest in foreign affairs. The relationship between the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary is essentially close making the relationship and ability to work together with a success. Most importantly, the Heads of the governments have a major role to play in the formation and implementation of foreign policy. The membership of the EU seems to have made an impact on this. This creation has been implemented and standardized by the European Council, bringing European heads of state and government together in quarterly meetings, which set the corporate strategy for Europe's foreign policy and the CFSP goals. Therefore, the foreign policies of each UK Prime Minister will be discussed in order to identify their national interest and their relationship with the EU.

The UK's European Foreign Policy

The UK's accession to the European Economic Community paved the path to an uncomprehensive European foreign policy. Through this accession, the UK wished to mold its future directions on the European politics, security, and political economy of Europe under a leading figure. The member states who had joined the EU decades before the UK joining had achieved the status of "developed country" while the newly joined UK was seen as an awkward partner in the EU's functions. Yet, the changes in the international system smoothed down the disparities and maintained the unified and collective status in the European region. However, the UK strategy's aspect was frequently at

odds with the goals that it had set itself. The founding Member States had formed in decades before the United Kingdom became a member of the European Union. This gave rise to the impression that the UK was an 'awkward partner' in intra-EU diplomacy. Nevertheless, the wider strategy of the Cold War permitted this to happen. Differences of emphasis to be put on and subsumed in the preservation of the united ad collective stance on defense in Western Europe.

The relationship between the UK and EU is identified as the UK's European foreign policy which paves the way for the UK to enter into bilateral and multilateral agreements with the rest of the world. The EU-UK foreign policy incorporates policies and resources which let the UK achieve the national interest through EU institutions and association with other member states. Through their foreign relations, the UK always tried to perceive its security and defense strategies. The United Kingdom has not followed its European foreign policy by formally describing a comprehensive plan for Europe, including the EU.

The UK's wider global strategy and security strategy objectives (including those for Europe) have, on the other hand, being more rigorous. The National Security Strategy (NSS) and the National Security Strategy (NSS) are codified and routinely described. Strategic Analysis of Defense and Security (SDSR). The relative attention that should be paid to Europe within the context of a wider UK approach. A key topic in British foreign policy has been international relations ever since the founding of the modern British state, strategy. The EU and Europe are central to the UK's diplomacy, defense, and security. The link between Brexit, the position of the UK in Europe, and its broader international role is highly debatable (Whitman, 2018).

Political Leadership and the CFSP

British officials' attitude towards the CFSP has been extremely argumentative from one tenure to the other. In exploring the consensus of the officials towards the CFSP, it can be divided into periods according to the specific leader. The period from 1990-1997 is identified as the Pusillanimous realism under the regime of Prime Minister John Major. Then the Pragmatic vision from 1997-2007 under the PM Tony Blair. Finally, the Defensive engagement period between 2007-2015 under the regimes of Prime Ministers Gordon Brown and David Cameron. These areas focus on practical application and continuity emphasizing the British leadership role and achieving their foreign policy objectives rather than institution building. Thus, the evolution of the foreign policy of Britain can be identified as mentioned below under each PM's regime (Wright, 2019).

Pusillanimous Realism

During this vision of PM John Major from 1990-1997, the British approach towards foreign policy cooperation with the EU is of two folds. First, it was accentuated that the European Political Cooperation (EPC) and European Economic Cooperation (EEC) should remain separately functioning under two separate institutions. Secondly, attention was given to the decision-making procedure within the EU, which at all times should be intergovernmental, where every state takes part in the decision-making procedure. These two principles molded the base for Britain to negotiate the CFSP of the EU under the Maastricht Treaty. Thus, together with France and Germany, Britain finalized the CFSP during 1990-1991. Europe was in dire need of creating a political union after the Cold War and the unification of Germany. Therefore, Britain had no choice at the time other than to abide by the then prevailing aspirations of the European system. For Britain, the CFSP was an

intergovernmental collaboration forum among sovereign states. It was not the responsibility of the member states working through the CFSP to put an end to the ongoing conflicts among European states. Instead, the task of the CFSP was to avoid rivalries between the Member States without being biased over the conflicts (Whitman, 2018).

PM John Major's government quite liked the idea of the new European system as it paved the way for them to achieve their main foreign policy principles namely, the separation of economic and political cooperation and involving the member states in the decision-making procedure. It helped them to develop a framework where settlements are achieved through negotiation when a dispute arises. The efficiency and productivity of the CFSP were challenged when the Bosnian and Yugoslavian conflicts arose during this period. Therefore, the defects in the CFSP were addressed in 1996, through the intergovernmental conference which produced the Treaty of Amsterdam. Britain reinforced many of the proposed reforms, which included creating a High Representative for CFSP provided that the representative should remain within the institutional structures of the Council without surpassing them. Yet, by that time the situation in Britain was quite disruptive concerning the integration process (Hetten, 1999). Therefore, they aimed to appoint a pro-European Labour government. Later, the then Foreign Secretary Robin Cook mentioned at the House of Commons that the new Labour government will participate in the Amsterdam summit with the spirit of partnership, not with the aim to oppose the integration process.

Pragmatic Vision

This Pragmatic vision was identified as the principal assumption of British foreign policy where central and clear leadership was the core. This vision took place during 1997-2007 under PM Tony Blair who

had pro-European credentials. Under the newly appointed Labour government, they build productive engagement with the European states as a result of the Amsterdam negotiations. Thus, once Blair was appointed in office, he sought to have relations with Germany and other like-minded states in Europe. Blair was of the stance where he believed that strengthening the EU- British relationship would allow Britain to become the core decision-maker at the EU. He also believed that there is no possibility to mold Europe unless Britain becomes a powerful state in Europe. Consequently, Blair attempted to create a sustainable change in the British and European relationship. Yet, his attempts became futile due to many reasons. Mostly, the 9/11 attack and the British alliance with the US Bush administration during the 2003 Iraq war weakened Britain's position in the European region (Moravcsik, 2002).

Additionally, Gordon Brown's influence in domestic affairs where he vetoed the British membership in the EU's single currency agreement through his economic tests. These reasons mainly had a negative impact on Blair's leadership centered on British foreign policy towards the EU. Nevertheless, Blair wanted to make an impact on the international system through their policies and capabilities having the need to have a higher aim in achieving a global reach where they did not want to be confined only to Europe and Atlantic states. Ironically, Britain was not necessarily armored with the necessary economic and material resources. Yet, Britain possessed the pragmatism or the practical approach in influencing its allies in the path Britain wanted to achieve indirectly making Britain a powerful influencer and an achiever. Blair also believed that Britain should work as the bridge between US and European foreign relations which would permit Britain to have a valid stance in the EU activities. Making his wishes and

attempts a reality in 1998, the Anglo-French St. Malo agreement was signed paving the path to establishing the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP/CSDP). This was identified as the most successful and striking contribution by PM Blair towards the EU. Hitherto, the CSDP always remained junior to NATO regarding the military powers (Wright, 2019).

The CSDP suggested a few initiatives to manage the crisis within the region. The introduction of the EU Battlegroups which is the military unit adhering to the CSDP was also achieved under Blair's regime making his aspirations to drive Britain towards controlling the European region. His aspirations to make an influence went beyond the European region. For an instance, his Chicago speech on the "Doctrine of the International Community" questioned the involvement of the states in domestic conflicts which will pose a risk to international stability through spreading confusion and disorder within the international system. Therefore, Blair emphasized that, in order to establish order and sovereignty, the concept of non-intervention has to be respected by the states all around the world. Thus, both PMs Tony Blair and John Major identified and believed Britain to have an international role even though it was Blair who made it a reality through the CSDP providing Britain with autonomy in security making Britain a vital and effective partner for the US. Yet, his once magnificent and once vague foreign policy objectives never identified ways to maintain the British-US relations within Europe.

Defensive Engagement

The defensive approach was used by two PMs from 2007-2015. PM Gordon Brown and PM David Cameron in their tenures tried to redefine the British attitude towards the EU. Brown identified the need to have an internationalized foreign policy for Britain given the 2008 worldwide

financial crisis. Through G20 and other multilateral agreements, he sought to face the financial crisis believing the fact that in order to have solutions for the crisis it is necessary to have a vigorous and prosperous economy domestically as well. Brown also believed in the Anglo-American relationship where Britain acts as the bridge between the US and Europe. He lacked the reputed "Euroenthusiasm" and sought to criticize the EU initiatives. Yet, ironically his decision to sign the Treaty of Lisbon proved that he was still in the idea of Euroenthusiasm despite the strategy he was following (Whitman, 2018).

Brown's lenient approach towards foreign policy allowed the then Foreign Secretary David Miliband to have autonomy regarding foreign policy formation. He identified the CFSP and EU as great assets in foreign policy formation. Yet, there was a sense of frustration and doubt taking place in Britain due to the EU states' foreign policy cooperation in travel and most importantly towards the development of the CSDP. There were doubts regarding the CSDP as the defense instrument of the EU and the stance of EU member states as military states towards the CSDP gradually diminished its value. Altogether the military commitments were also escalating in Afghanistan making the situation more complex in Europe. Consequently, in 2010 Britain decided to gradually withdraw from the CSDP. The withdrawal from the CSDP was highlighted under the government of David Cameron from 2010-2015 paying more attention towards EU foreign policy cooperation. Cameron's tenure can be identified as the period where Defensive engagement came into action shifting from the pragmatic vision. Cameron adopted a modest and realistic approach towards foreign policy formation. He allowed his Foreign Secretary William Hague to take the lead in foreign policy formation. They followed a liberal-

conservative foreign policy based on Britain's economic, military, and diplomatic capabilities (Manoranjan, 2007).

Cameron was directly and personally involved in the 2011 NATO mission in Libya and the 2010 Lancaster House defense agreement with France. Yet, he was unsuccessful in obtaining support within the House for American-led intervention in Syria which ultimately weakened Britain's ability to make an international influence. Britain also did not take part in the Normandy Format; France and Germany led engagement to solve the Ukrainian crisis. Being away from the Normandy Format lured many criticisms towards Britain. European states criticized Britain's actions as being foreign policy irrelevant, while the US considered British attitude as not being active and engaged in the system. Even the European Union Committee of the House of Lords disapproved of Britain's stance as being inactive and invisible in the Ukrainian crisis. These critiques have referred to the approach of Cameron to the EU's international foreign policy co-operation. The EU was seen along with the Eurocentric compassion within the group of states and within the House itself.

Apparently, there was a sense of detachment from Britain's part from the EU activities. Britain detached itself from the CFSP debates and the British stance on certain issues was not clearly articulated. In another instance, the government's hesitant and lethargic approach to support the European External Action Service under the Lisbon Treaty provided a soothing commitment to cost and budget neutrality. British inconsistency in the benefits of the CFSP and CSDP had been taking place for quite some time even among the public (Moravcsik, 2002).

The UK public also maintained a quite low level of support for European integration than demonstrated in other member states. Public disbelief on

European integration was somewhat in disagreement with the views of the foreign policymaking elites that demonstrated a greater investment in the advantages for the UK of EU membership. Consequently, towards the end of the 2000s, there was a comprehensive frustration evolving towards the UK foreign policy formation over the failure of the CFSP and CSDP. Since there were doubts and frustrations on the CSDP and CFSP, the Cameron government tried to establish a cohesive approach to national security. Thus, they launched the Diplomatic Excellence Initiative to expand the British diplomatic network and to place its budget on a stable point. Setting up a new National Security Council and the release of the National Security Strategy 2010 (NSS) were both attempts together with a National Defense and Security Review to introduce better rationality and concentration while making clear that the UK will continue to play an international part despite its inadequate resources (Wright, 2019).

The NSS clarified that to safeguard its interests, Britain needed to retain the willingness to partner with its allies to have a strategic presence. This was further strengthened by the Anglo-French Lancaster House defense agreement which was signed in 2010. Both France and Britain had a mutual standing on defense and security, which was established through the British Strategic Defense and Security Review (SDSR) and French Defense White Paper which was drafted with British expertise advice. These initiatives by Britain and France proved the fact that they had lost faith in EU efforts to stimulate defense cooperation and enhancing the capabilities of states. Thus, the EU's most significant military powers faced a lack of commitments including Germany. They were prepared to enter bilateral military co-operations, removing themselves from the CSDP and CFSP. Thus, whilst this period undoubtedly saw a marked rise in

Eurosceptic attitudes at the highest political level, the shift to 'defensive engagement' that defined UK participation in CFSP during this period was not responsible for these levels alone. Likewise, the British relationship with the CFSP since its inception from the Treaty of Maastricht in 1991 to the end of David Cameron's government can be mentioned. It can be vividly seen that, despite the differences in regimes, there was a remarkable similarity in placing the foreign policy of Britain giving priority to internationalization through multilateral cooperation.

CONCLUSION

The EU-UK relationship has been quite awkward and distant since the beginning of the relations and the foreign policy formation since the 1990s has not been of any difference. The foreign policy of the British leaders with the EU since 1990 has been quite distant and mainly focused on internationalization while becoming a powerful state in the international system. While focusing on the EU-UK foreign policy the evolution of the EU and most importantly the Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union was also discussed paying much attention as the focal point of the study. Likewise, the British relationship with the CFSP since its inception from the Treaty of Maastricht in 1991 to the end of David Cameron's government can be mentioned.

It can be vividly seen that, despite the differences in regimes, there was a remarkable similarity in placing the foreign policy of Britain giving priority to internationalization through multilateral cooperation rather than abiding by a regional supranational body. During the 3 tenures under the four Prime Ministers, it is visible that there was a gradual degrading of the EU-UK relationship. All the Prime Ministers wanted to take part in the international arena and showcase their

capabilities through internationalization together with the US rather than being confined to the European region. Britain always strived to stand alone as a regional and a global power through the formulations of their foreign policy. This confinement was seen as a burden to the UK as they had the potential to do better in the international system while standing independently. In order to fill the gap in foreign policy, the UK will have to enter into bilateral and diplomatic relations with the other European states. UK has the capacity to play an international role and influence the EU even without being a part of the EU as the UK is a Veto power member of UNSC and NATO. Therefore, renouncing the EU membership will not make a great impact on UK's foreign policy aspect as the UK can survive independently be powerful in the international system. Thus, it can be concluded that with the strong Eurosceptic ideology, which is rising within the European region, the UK will survive independently in the international system giving prominence to the internationalization process and remaining as a powerful state as Britain had done for centuries.

REFERENCES

- Artatrana, G. (2014). *Regionalism and sub-regionalism: A theoretical framework with special reference to India*. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 8(1), 10–26. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ajpsir2013.0611>
- Baldwin, R. E., & Venables, A. J. (1995). *Regional economic integration*. In *Handbook of International Economics* (Vol. 3, Issue C, pp. 1597–1644). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4404\(05\)80011-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4404(05)80011-5)
- Basu, R., (2012) *International Politics, India: Sage Publications*.
- Dunn, T. M. (2012). *Neo-Functionalism and the European Union*. 1–3.

- Eizenstat, S. (2017). *THE EUROPEAN UNION COULD BE SIMPLE , INCLUSIVE , OREFFECTIVE .*
- Facwcette,L., Hurrell,A. (1995) *Regionalism in World Politics.* Oxford University Press.
- Geddes, A. (2012). *Regions and Regionalism.* In *Oxford Handbook of the Politics of International Migration.* <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195337228.013.0023>
- Hettne, Björn, & Söderbaum, F. (2007). *The future of regionalism: Old divides, new frontiers. Regionalisation and Global Governance: The Taming of Globalisation?*, January 2008, 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203933398>
- Hettne, Bjerne, & Inotai, A. (1994). *Research for Action The New Regionalism.*
- Haas, Ernst B. *The uniting of Europe: political, social, and economic forces, 1950-1957 I Originall.* published; Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1958.
- Hadfield, A., Manners,I and Whitman. R.G. (2017) *Foreign Policies of EU Member States*, New York: Routledge.
- Hettne B. (1999) *Globalization and the New Regionalism: The Second Great Transformation.* In: Hettne B., Inotai A., Sunkel O. (eds) *Globalism and the New Regionalism. The New Regionalism.* Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-27268-6_1
- Hoffman, S. (1991) *The New European Community: Decision making and Institutional Change* Colorada: Westview Press
- Integration, W. H. Y. R. (2003). *From the literature 3 and experience, some traditional and non-traditional gains from regional integration arrangements could be identified, including: 2.1 Traditional Gains from Regional Integration Arrangements. 1–12.* https://sarpn.org/documents/d0001249/P1416-RI-concepts_May2005.pdf
- Introduction, C. I. (42 C.E.). *Regionalism: Theory and Practice.* Hurrell 1995. http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/14503/8/08_chapter_1.pdf
- Manoranjan, D. (2007). *Historical Progression of the European Union.* In M. Dutta (Ed.), *European Union and the Euro Revolution* (Vol. 283, pp. 31–54). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S0573-8555\(2007\)0000283007](https://doi.org/10.1108/S0573-8555(2007)0000283007)
- Molchanov, M. A. (2005). *Regionalism and globalization: The case of the European Union.* *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*, 4(3), 431–446. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156915005775093205>
- Moravcsik, A. (2002) *In Defence of the Democratic Deficit: Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union'* *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40/4: 603-624
- Rosamond, B. (1999) *Theories of European Integration* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan)
- Smeets, S., & Beach, D. (2020). *Intergovernmentalism and its implications—new institutional leadership in major EU reforms.* *Journal of European Public Policy*, 27(8), 1137–1156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2019.1699940>
- Söderbaum, F. (2012). *Theories of regionalism.* *Routledge Handbook of Asian Regionalism*, January 2011, 11–21. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203803608-10>
- Wagner,W. (2003) *Why the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy will remain Intergovernmental: A Rationalist Institutional Choice Analysis of European Crisis Management Policy'*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(4), pp.576-595.
- Wallace, H., Pollack, M. and Young, A. R. (2005), *Policy-Making in the European Union.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, N. (2019) *New Perspectives In German Political Studies The EU's Common Foreign And Security Policy In Germany And The Uk.* Palgrave Mcmillan, London