

Foreign Policies of United States vs. United Kingdom

Michel Demissie*

Department of public research, University of Sheffield, South Yorkshire, England

HISTORY OF THE SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP

The first, short-lived British colony in Virginia was organized in 1584, and permanent English settlement began in 1607. The United States declared its independence from Great Britain in 1776. The American Revolutionary War ended in 1783, with Great Britain recognizing U.S. independence. The two countries established diplomatic relations in 1785. The United States broke relations when it declared war on the United Kingdom during the War of 1812; relations were reestablished in 1815.

The United States has no closer ally than the United Kingdom, and British foreign policy emphasizes close coordination with the United States. Bilateral cooperation reflects the common language, ideals, and democratic practices of the two nations. Relations were strengthened by the United Kingdom's alliance with the United States during both World Wars, in the Korean conflict, in the Persian Gulf War, in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and in Afghanistan, as well as through its role as a founding member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The United Kingdom and the United States continually consult on foreign policy issues and global problems and share major foreign and security policy objectives.

Regarding Northern Ireland, which is part of the United Kingdom, "Nationalist" and "Republican" groups seek a united Ireland that includes Northern Ireland, while "Unionists" and "Loyalists" want Northern Ireland to remain part of the United Kingdom. U.S. priorities continue to be supporting the peace process and devolved political institutions in Northern Ireland and encouraging the implementation of the U.S.-brokered 1998 Belfast Agreement, also known as the Good Friday Agreement, and the 2006 St. Andrews Agreement.

U.S. ASSISTANCE TO THE UNITED KINGDOM

The International Fund for Ireland (IFI), created in 1986, provides funding for projects to generate cross-community engagement and economic opportunity in Northern Ireland (the United Kingdom) and the border counties of Ireland. Since the IFI's establishment, the United States and EU have contributed the vast majority of funds, with the United States allocating more than \$543 million over the lifespan of the IFI.

Funding for IFI is obligated via USAID. Annual funding since FY1986 is available via the sites below:

- U.S. Foreign Aid dashboard: Ireland
- The International Fund for Ireland (.com website)

BILATERAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Mutual trade and investment are at the heart of our prosperity, and our commitment to free market values enables our economies to thrive. The United States and the United Kingdom are the world's first and fifth largest economies in the world. We currently trade over \$260 billion worth of goods and services each year. We are each other's number one source of foreign direct investment and two-way direct investment totals over \$1 trillion.

Every U.S. state has jobs that are connected to an investment by a U.K. company. More than 1.2 million Americans work for U.K. companies in the United States, and over 1.5 million Britons are directly employed by U.S. firms. The top U.S. exports to the United Kingdom include aircraft, machinery, financial and travel services, and agricultural products, such as wine and beer.

The United Kingdom's Membership in International Organizations

Along with France, both the United States and the United Kingdom are among the five permanent members of the UN Security Council (P5) and are founding members of NATO. In addition, the United Kingdom and the United States belong to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), G-20, G-7, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Trade Organization. The United Kingdom also is an observer to the Organization of American States.

BILATERAL REPRESENTATION

The Ambassador, or Chief of Mission, is the highest ranking American official in the United Kingdom. The position's full title is "Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary". It is

*Correspondence to: Michel Demissie, Department of public research, University of Sheffield, South Yorkshire, England; E-Mail: michell@unrn.edu.ar

Received date: May 25, 2021; Accepted date: September 14, 2021; Published date: September 24, 2021

Citation: Demissie M (2021) Foreign policies of united states vs. united kingdom. J Pol Sci Pub Aff 09: p748

Copyright: © 2021 Demissie M. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

“extraordinary” in that the Ambassador is the personal representative of the President of the United States to Her Majesty the Queen. The “plenipotentiary” in the title indicates full power to negotiate. As well as being responsible for the work of the various sections of the Embassy, the Ambassador coordinates the activities of all departments and agencies of the United States Government with representatives in Britain.

Assisting the Ambassador is the Deputy Chief of Mission (DCM), a position carrying the rank of Minister. The DCM is responsible for the day to-day running of the Embassy and also undertakes high-level representation, negotiation, appraisal, and reporting duties. In the Ambassador’s absence the Minister becomes Chargé D’Affaires ad interim (Chargé D’Affaires a. i.), thereby assuming all the Ambassador’s functions and responsibilities. The current DCM is Yael Lempert.

Representatives from the U.S. State Department and 26 other U.S. Government agencies manage portfolios concerning economic, commercial and agricultural affairs, consular and immigration issues, customs, transportation, and law enforcement activities, as well as political and military relations, and public affairs.

REFERENCES

1. Feachem RGA, Sekhri NK, White KL. Getting more for their dollar: a comparison of the NHS with California's Kaiser Permanente [commentaries by Dixon J, Berwick DM, and Enthoven AC]. *BMJ* 2002;324: 135-43
2. Correspondence. Getting more for their dollar: Kaiser v the NHS. *BMJ* 2002;324: 1332-5.
3. Talbot-Smith A, Gnani S, Pollock AM, Gray DP. Questioning the claims from Kaiser. *Br J Gen Pract* 2004;54: 415-21.
4. Ham C, York N, Sutch S, Shaw R. Hospital bed utilisation in the NHS, Kaiser Permanente, and the US Medicare programme: analysis of routine data. *BMJ* 2003;327:1257-60
5. Roland M. Linking physicians' pay to the quality of care—a major experiment in the United Kingdom. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351: 1448-54.
6. Rawlins MD. NICE work—providing guidance to the British National Health Service. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351: 1383-5.
7. Murphy E. Case management and community matrons for long term conditions. *BMJ* 2004;329: 1251-2.
8. Committee on Quality of Healthcare in America. Crossing the quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine, 2001.
9. Davis DA, Thomson MA, Oxman AD, Haynes RB. Evidence for the effectiveness of CME. A review of 50 randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 1992;268: 1111-7.
10. Humber M. National programme for information technology. *BMJ* 2004;328: 1145-6.
11. Wanless D. Securing our future health: taking a long term view. London: HM Treasury, 2002.