

Introduction

Alan P. Dobson and Steve Marsh



Cogito, ergo sum

—René Descartes

as we know, there are known knowns; there are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns; that is to say we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns – the ones we don't know we don't know. And if one looks throughout the history of our country and other free countries, it is the latter category that tend to be the difficult ones.

—Donald Rumsfeld: US Secretary of Defence 2001–6

For the seventeenth-century French philosopher René Descartes, the act of thinking was the existential precursor of all else, the only thing he could be certain of. It was the evidence of self. From his 'I think therefore I am' proposition necessarily flowed many questions. How am I similar or different to others? How do individual thinking-selves differ from collectives of thinking-selves? How does like-thinking impact the behaviour of individuals and polities? Such questions have often driven thinkers in Britain and the United States in surprisingly similar directions. British and American governments, too, have responded to such thought and challenges in not dissimilar ways, despite the American republic first being defined in opposition to the British monarchy. As we shall see, good correspondence and friendship between Britain and its former colonies were not easy to sever.¹ Interestingly, since then, some of the thinking on both sides has fallen into Donald Rumsfeld's category of known unknowns. For example, we know intuitively that political ideas and concepts have an impact, but exactly how and to what extent is often opaque, to say the least. And in investigating this kind of known unknown there is always the possibility of revealing previously unknown unknowns. Such concerns are

important because Anglo-American policymakers have frequently lauded the uniquely positive implications of a 'common cast of mind' for co-operation. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson put matters thus in January 1975 at a summit meeting with President Gerald Ford: 'We don't have, you know, to spend about fifty minutes in every hour arguing about first principles, arguing about trying to convince one another. They are thoroughly practical and that's why you get six times as much results out of an hour of discussions such of the kind we've had.'² It is the sharing of these first principles, or the question of how there came to be a common cast of mind, that is the focus of investigation here.

John Winthrop's City upon a Hill through Thomas Jefferson's Empire of Liberty and Ronald Reagan's Evil Empire speech suggest that the United States, more than Britain, has overtly styled itself upon ideals that inform practice. And those ideals are often characterized as forming part of America's exceptionalism. For example, such a notion of exceptionalism is at the heart of Louis Hartz's iconic thesis set out in *The Liberal Tradition in America*.³ Yet rarely are such ideals uniquely American or alien to Britons. Famous first principles enshrined in the US Constitution and political and legal practice as a guide for the new republic, including due legal process, political representation and inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, were effectively inherited from the motherland. A shared commitment to democratic government and the rule of law help explain the Anglo-American underpinning of some of the great experiments in collective security and international law and organization. Furthermore, first Britain and later the United States have evinced a common commitment to spreading their ideals abroad, sometimes contentiously so, as in relation to Anglo-Saxon supremacy, the white man's burden and forcible democratization.

It was over three hundred years after Descartes discovered certainty as a thinking self that Donald Rumsfeld pondered the knowledge that thinking might bring in his (in)famous 'known knowns' speech. While 'unknown unknowns' most troubled Rumsfeld, known knowns could evidently be worked with or legislated against. Anglo-American relations, especially since the Second World War, have largely fallen into the latter category. That is not to say there have been no surprises: Suez, Skybolt, President Nixon's opening to China, British withdrawal from east of Suez, the US invasion of Grenada and experience with President Donald Trump were all unanticipated. Nevertheless, for the most part, knowledge of one another's culture, society, politics, foreign-policy objectives and so forth has been unusually strong. Reciprocal learning has been facilitated by the English language and has been accumulated over centuries of shared experiences and interpenetration at all levels of society. How and to what effect political ideas and values play out in

international affairs may well be more difficult to explain than, for example, power and national self-interest, but this should not preclude exploration of their role.

Numerous opinion polls have revealed consistently high levels of popular affiliation between Britons and Americans. Also, from the Second World War and Churchill's invocation of the special relationship in his 1946 Fulton speech,⁴ Anglo-American foreign policies have exhibited unusually high levels of correlation. This phenomenon has been attributed in part to the so-called layered cake of transatlantic bureaucratic intermeshing, so much so that some scholars argue that there is a distinctive Anglo-American style of diplomacy.⁵ Indeed, in 1982, former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger spoke explicitly of how the wartime habit of intimate, informal collaboration became 'a permanent practice'. He emphasized, too, that 'The ease and informality of the Anglo-American partnership has been a source of wonder – and no little resentment – to third countries. Our post-war diplomatic history is littered with Anglo-American "arrangements" and "understandings," sometimes on crucial issues, never put into formal documents.'⁶

One might fairly assume from the above, then, that this book about the impact on Anglo-American relations of ideals, thought, political values and transatlantic reciprocal learning at multiple levels of government and society would sit comfortably in the mainstream of analyses of the special relationship. Yet this is not the case. Instead, a longstanding predominance of realist approaches in international relations (IR) and diplomatic history has caused consideration of such 'first principles' to be eschewed in favour of rational calculations of mutual utility based on more apparently tangible factors such as power and national interest, and detailing changes in the quantity and quality of functional co-operation over time. Such approaches appeal to many scholars because they appear to be scientific in a soft sense, marked by observations regarding clearly defined self-interest and calculations about, and the deployment of, visible power in what appear to be clear cause-and-effect relationships.

Realists range from Thucydides to Machiavelli, from Carl von Clausewitz to E.H. Carr, from Hans J. Morgenthau to Kenneth Waltz and John Mearsheimer. The roll call is impressive and it should be clearly noted that it includes eminent historians as well as IR scholars. In his classic work of realism, Hans J. Morgenthau remarked that: 'A realist theory of international politics will ... avoid the ... popular fallacy of equating the foreign policies of statesmen with his philosophy or political sympathies, and of deducing the former from the latter.'⁷ Realism metamorphosed through many stages, later emerging as structural or neorealism, as it was sometimes called, with key exponents such as Kenneth Waltz and John Mearsheimer presenting a

quasi-scientific theory of how states behave.⁸ For Mearsheimer, the component and determining variables are an anarchic or non-hierarchical international system; the offensive military capability of all states; chronic uncertainty about state intentions; the paramount goal of the survival of the state; and the rationality of state action.⁹

With regard to realist historians, or at least those heavily influenced by realism, many who have studied the Anglo-American relationship over the past half-century have foregrounded utilitarian interest: scholars such as Christopher Thorne, C.J. Bartlett, John Dumbrell, John Bayliss, Ian Clark, Jonathan Colman, Sylvia Ellis, Nigel Ashton, James Ellison and David Reynolds.¹⁰ And while some would agree with Bartlett's caveat that 'hard-headed calculations in both Washington and London in response to the grim realities of power politics do not wholly explain the remarkable Anglo-American relationship which developed after 1941', the pervasive emphasis on the hard calculation of interests abides among many historians.¹¹ One can with considerable plausibility assert and illustrate direct cause and effect between the pursuit of self-interest rationally calculated, the rational deployment of power to pursue chosen ends and the results that ensue. It is far more difficult to quantify the impact of ideas upon decisions and actions.

All forms of realism, be they in historical or IR scholarship, are reductionist in that they seek to identify the key dynamics that move international affairs and determine their outcomes while relying heavily on the notion of rational actors. Of course, there are different disciplinary motivations. Like other theories applied in IR, realism has the laudable objective of trying to improve the way the international system operates and, above all, avoid war. In this sense, there is a practical and prescriptive policy aspect to realism in IR. History is no less abstract in its assumptions than science; what could be more abstract than trying to study the past, which, by definition, has gone? Well, it has gone except for the evidence left in the present to suggest what the past may have been: memory, conventions, ways of thinking, institutions and artefacts, images and contemporary written evidence. For many historians, especially when dealing with interstate relationships, the reasons of actors, those who make decisions with important political, economic and strategic consequences, are of major importance. Where realism bites is in the dominant assumption that individuals and governments act rationally in the definition and pursuit of national interests and that therein there is little scope for intangible factors such as ideals, values and senses of affinity to influence behaviour.

All of this gives rise to some potentially serious problems for the approaches adopted by the contributors to this book. However, there is good reason to develop alternative perspectives on Anglo-American relations. First of all there is a combination of the so-called cultural turn in international history

and the weaknesses in (neo-)realist explanatory narratives exposed by the end of the Cold War. For Richard Ned Lebow, neorealism had ‘denuded Realism of its complexity and subtlety, appreciation of agency and understanding that power is most readily transformed into influence when it is both masked and embedded in a generally accepted system of norms’.¹² Lebow noted, too, that in the later stages of Morgenthau’s intellectual journey, values and beliefs are re-entered into the calculus of how states operate in the international system. This would seem more akin to the work presented here, although significant differences remain.¹³ Concomitantly, Akira Iriye et al.’s argument that the ‘cultural turn’ raised a ‘fundamental question of the relationship between a country’s cultural system and its behaviour in the international system’ gained ground.¹⁴ For the likes of Alexander Wendt, this meant that a more thorough understanding of historical causation could be formed by considering the hard realities of geopolitics in the context of the cultural discourses that shape identity and imagination.¹⁵

Secondly, as we have argued elsewhere, there are limitations to what Steve Smith and Martin Hollis refer to as the ‘outside’ style of explanation adopted by writers such as Morgenthau. One might be tempted to say that the outside is not as wide-ranging as the word might suggest, with the scope of focus being reduced by assumptions regarding what are judged to be important determinants or variables.¹⁶ Equally, one might suggest that it is a serious error to take interests as rational givens. Self-interest for suicide bombers consists in a rational route to heaven through their violent actions, but this could never be a rational action for a non-believer or for a believer with a different route map to heaven. One person’s rationality is determined differently to that of another. This is an extreme example, but it illustrates the importance of interrogating ideas and their function in helping to shape international affairs. What comes to be seen as an interest is often moulded by common beliefs and values, which usually lead to the establishment of common interests. This is a mutually and self-reinforcing dynamic. And it is important to note that once one appreciates these takes on rational action, interests and sentiments, they change the way usable power is conceptualized and its use determined.

Consider, for instance, a bitter row in the early 1990s between Britain and the United States over the latter’s desire to replace the ailing airlines TWA and Pan Am with American and United Airlines at Heathrow Airport, which was, at the time, the busiest and most important international hub in the world. The situation was complex, but essentially Britain had an unassailable advantage because of an American commitment made during negotiations in 1980 that restricted them to two airlines at Heathrow, which should be TWA and Pan Am or their corporate successors.¹⁷ As neither American nor United Airlines had any corporate connection with Pan Am or TWA, the British

response to demands that they be allowed to enter into Heathrow was to say yes, of course, but you have to pay. It was not something that the airlines had an automatic right to.

The Americans were incandescent. Paul Wisgerhof of the US State Department suggested by-passing Britain altogether and angrily declared: 'I don't think we need the UK if we have an open-skies agreement with Germany. And my personal preference would be to tell Mr. Rifkind [UK Secretary of State for Transport] and Mr. Moss [UK Under Secretary for International Aviation, Department of Transport] to go stuff it.'¹⁸ Not the kind of language one might expect from a diplomat. And ill feeling towards Britain was not confined to the State Department. For example, Cyril Murphy of United Airlines was equally outraged and particularly angry at the British press, of which he said 'it was like this is our chance to get even for the American Revolution'.¹⁹ The whole affair was clearly pretty bad; it is remarkable that it happened when British and American forces were fighting shoulder to shoulder in the First Gulf War.

Rather surprisingly, more even-tempered views were expressed in the US Department of Transportation. Maybe institutional memory in that department stretched back to the Bermuda 1 Anglo-American Air Service Agreement of 1946, when the boot was on the other foot and Americans ruthlessly extracted concessions from the British.²⁰ Whatever the case, there was a kind of understanding regarding how the United States and Britain related to each other that had been temporarily eclipsed among State Department officials and US airline executives because of the anger into which they had been tipped by the Heathrow succession rights talks. Paul Gretch, Director of the Office of International Aviation, US Department of Transportation, after all the difficulties he had experienced at first hand in the recent talks, still felt that 'the UK would be the preferred partner in Europe to get where we want to go'. One reason for this was hard-headed calculation, because Britain was the largest European market for US airlines. The other reason had more to do with those 'first principles': 'I don't know that the Germans really share our views philosophically. I think deep down the UK does.'²¹

The point of this aside is to underscore what, at the start of this introduction, seemed self-evident: that, contrary to central tenets of realism, first principles do seem to matter in Anglo-American relations. None of us contributors seek to devalue realism in our contributions. Rather, we seek to expand analytic horizons beyond the relatively narrow confines of realism writ large. As C.A.W. Manning put it many years ago: 'Actually it is right choosings that we want, between concrete alternatives, not rightness as opposed to wrongness, in the abstract.'²² Manning was no realist, being instead a founding member of the English School that tried to reconcile realism with idealism/liberalism, but the

point is well made concerning the world of practice. And one of the overriding principles of practice is guidance that works, as opposed to a search for often esoteric truths.

This book, then, seeks to encourage a rebalancing of scholarship on Anglo-American relations by approaching historical truth – or, if that is too highfalutin, accuracy – through an invocation of the world of ideas. It is a collective endeavour that starts from a common assumption: important political, economic and strategic decisions can be better understood when they are contextualized within the various and often intersecting traditions of thought, values, ideas and practices that prevailed contemporaneously. By interrogating the notion of a shared Anglo-American political tradition stretching back to the founding of the American republic and beyond, we hope to deepen understanding of the nature and conduct of Anglo-American relations through to the present and, in doing so, reveal the importance of some of the known unknowns. Necessarily, this brings us to a few final observations about focus and structure. What do we mean when we speak of an Anglo-American political tradition? Much scholarship has already sought to identify the American and British political traditions. For example, the British political tradition is often seen as resting primarily on a set of nineteenth-century ideas centred on particular appreciations of governance and democracy, which draws on a rich history embracing romanticized views of Anglo-Saxon democracy, the Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights. A.H. Birch's *Representative and Responsible Government*²³ advanced a view of this tradition as an aggregate of ideas of representation and responsibility that emphasizes accountability to Parliament, conservative notions of responsibility, and prudent leadership. The following year, Samuel Beer added collectivism to this debate, along with strong government and high levels of continuity.²⁴ For their part, Michael J. Oakeshott emphasized rationality in non-ideological pragmatism²⁵ and Jack Greenleaf the dominant and interacting ideas of collectivism and libertarianism.²⁶ The primary manifestation of these ideas is the so-called Westminster model of governance, organized around historical continuity – actual or constructed – and the principle of parliamentary sovereignty and evinced in an elitist form of top-down government.²⁷ However, the idea of a dominant British political tradition is still far from uncontested. Mark Bevir and R.A.W. Rhodes, for instance, argue the case for the importance of contested political traditions in understanding British politics.²⁸ Similarly, the health or otherwise of the Westminster model itself in Britain continues to divide opinion.²⁹ With regard to the American political tradition, a common starting point is Richard Hofstadter's *The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It*. It is unfortunate that Hofstadter's interests did not stretch to the significance of women in the American political tradition, an omission that has only recently

begun to be amended by scholars such as Sue Davis and Lisa Pace Vetter.³⁰ Notwithstanding the importance of Hofstadter's omission, his characterization of the American way of political life still has value. He asserts a strong sense of continuity in core values, which can now be seen also to incorporate contributions by women, and he presents it as being founded on certain principles commonly regarded, consciously or subconsciously, as essential components of Americans' daily lives. As to what these might be, Hofstadter claims that there is consensus amongst competing traditions on the rights of property, a philosophy of economic individualism and the value of competition. For the political scientist Louis Hartz, this way of life is encapsulated in republicanism and liberalism, which constitute the dominant ideology of the United States.³¹ Hartz goes so far as to claim that this tradition is uniquely American – a claim we have challenged elsewhere in favour of seeing commonalities in the American and British traditions.³² Many component strands of American thought are evident in key eighteenth-century documents drafted as the US republic developed, including the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, *The Federalist Papers* and the Bill of Rights. And this written part of the tradition is perhaps the United States' most significant departure from Britain. At the core of the tradition is the constitution and the practice of judicial review, which seeks to prevent laws being applied that contradict or are incompatible with the constitution. Nothing in Britain is comparable to judicial review, given the overriding principle of parliamentary sovereignty. But such differences do not, as this volume amply demonstrates, create a chasm that prevents dialogue, understanding and a cross-fertilization of ideas.

As with its British counterpart, the American political tradition has necessarily evolved over time. In recent years, for instance, US domestic politics have been marked by increasing tension between modern conservatism and liberalism. More controversially, some scholars have identified in the American political tradition darker strands of thought associated with liberalism and republicanism. Consider, for instance, what Rogers M. Smith has termed a political tradition of ascriptive inegalitarianism, whereby, from the colonial period through the Progressive Era, full US citizenship was denied to various populations on the grounds of race, ethnicity or gender.³³

These notions of a distinctive American and British political tradition are important to our work, but they also lie at the opposite end of the analytic spectrum to our primary concern. Whereas they emphasize the national and the particular, we are concerned with ascertaining aspects of commonality, mutual learning and the transatlantic sharing of ideas and practices. In short, we need a richer understanding of political tradition. Cast in this light, it is important to appreciate first that political tradition is not necessarily state-centric. S.N. Eisenstadt, for instance, argued that:

Tradition can perhaps best be envisaged as the routine symbolisation of the models of social order and of the constellation of codes, the guidelines, which delineate the limits of the binding cultural order, of membership in it, and of its boundaries, which prescribe the 'proper' choices of goals and patterns of behaviour; it can also be seen as modes of evaluation as well as of the sanctioning and legitimisation of the 'totality' of the cultural and social order, or any of its parts.³⁴

Dig a little further into political tradition and it becomes apparent that it is a slippery concept, so much so that some have deemed the pursuit of an analytic definition worthless.³⁵ Fortunately for our purposes, it is sufficient to identify certain characteristics, functions and processes of political traditions, accepting as we do that these can be and are contested. Starting from first principles, the concept of 'tradition' derives from the Latin word *tradere*, meaning to transmit or hand over for safekeeping. In line with Eisenstadt, emphasis can therefore be placed on the content and/or the process of transmission that provides for political-cultural continuity. In addition, political traditions are seen as being broadly structured at mental, behavioural and institutional levels. Mamina Natalia Alekseevna, for instance, proposes the following. The mental level consists of political symbols, myths and stereotypes. These help to form the image of political reality and authority, as well as values and norms, which influence political behaviour. The behavioural level includes models of conduct and patterns of action, including political habits and rituals. Finally, the institutional level reflects historical features of interaction between branches of power and relations between a state and society.³⁶

On reflection, one might feel that these latter-day theorists are not saying much more than might be generically teased out of Edmund Burke's writings on his conception of the organic state. For Burke, the good polity was one with unbroken continuity that developed organically over time. Here, organically refers to change that comes about in a piecemeal manner in response to problems and dysfunctionalities in society. Change is a bottom-up rather than a top-down process that adjusts politics and governmental practice in order to deal pragmatically with problems that arise. According to this understanding of politics, institutions are more than just functioning bureaucracies: they embody aspects of wisdom from the past that are transmitted institutionally to the present in the way that they manage affairs. Of course, Burke made assumptions about what we would see as being specific to a form of conservatism, for example his views on fallen man and the limits of rationality, and that order was the prerequisite for the establishment and enjoyment of legally granted civil rights. Nevertheless, strip those away and one is still left with the idea of continuity, of a dialogue or conversation about politics that addresses different and emerging problems, adjusting the political, economic

and social landscapes over time. And such dialogues and conversations can take place between differing political doctrines, as well as within specific doctrines. However, clearly, there are limits to the differences that can be tolerated within a tradition. The idea of National Socialism, evident in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s, could not sit alongside liberalism within a single tradition. Furthermore, the idea of a revolutionary tradition seems oxymoronic. So, a political tradition is characterized by continuity and change, dialogue and conversations between and within different political doctrines, although these are bounded by certain limits, and it retains a familiar language, fundamental values and similar style that would enable one to travel back in time and still be understood. Our argument here is not only that someone who is British and someone who is American could travel back in time in their own respective traditions and grasp what was going on and feel more or less at home, but also that if they crossed over into each other's traditions, they would still feel the same. An anecdote recounted by an old friend and mentor, Warren Kimball, illustrates what we mean here. During a stopover at Heathrow with a group of other American historians after conferencing in the Soviet Union during the Cold War, one of his American colleagues, while refreshing himself, declared: 'It's good to be home!'

It is this broad appreciation of political tradition that we adopt in this book. This approach sets the book apart from some previous investigations of an Anglo-American political tradition based on narrower parameters of political thought.³⁷ More importantly, this appreciation is apposite for our particular objectives. We are not solely interested in identifying shared patterns of thought. Rather, we also seek insight into how that thought is transmitted and operationalized consciously and subconsciously through ideas and habits of organization and co-operation.

Organization and Chapter Overview

The structure and contributions to this book are determined by these research questions and our reading of political tradition. Of course, no single text can comprehensively examine all aspects of Anglo-American political ideas, which is significant in itself. Consequently, our approach has been to sample the transatlantic transmission of ideas by including carefully selected and commissioned chapters organized around three themes: political philosophy, institutions – broadly defined – and representations of an Anglo-American political tradition. The first section comprises four chapters, the first two of which are dedicated to demonstrating the continuity of the changing American republic as it came into being and gradually developed. Kristin

Cook begins by identifying features of the bonds that were preserved through revolution and those that were lost in the act of political severance. She interrogates how it is that the political bands were severed, while the tradition remained. Drawing upon a wide range of transatlantic pamphlets, memoirs and accounts, she demonstrates how undercurrents of sensibility, security and statecraft persisted and ensured an enduring relationship. In so doing, she assigns particular significance to the language of correspondence that frames the final 1783 Treaty of Peace (Paris).

Gavin Bailey then examines the legacies of two British thinkers who both had an important and long-lasting impact on what was to become the United States: Thomas Paine and Edmund Burke. In his intricate account of the interplay between the radicalism of Paine and the conservatism of Burke, Bailey demonstrates how Paine's radicalism was tempered by the Burkean embedding of exceptionalism and constitutional power in custom, alongside the evolution of a complementary continuum of Anglo-American shared ideals and national co-operation that would have dismayed Paine.

Alan P. Dobson and Reed Davis develop the reciprocal impact of ideas further in their analyses of two of the most important underlying political ideologies in both countries, namely liberalism and conservatism. They consider probably the most continuous and robust conversations within and between doctrines shared by Britain and the United States, exemplifying in the process how political traditions can tolerate highly divergent political narratives and values. Dobson even goes so far as to claim that it is liberalism that does more than any other doctrine to set the agenda in both countries: you are either seduced by liberalism or react against it. From John Locke to Ronald Dworkin and A.C. Grayling, he traces how the Liberal agenda has developed and interacted across the Atlantic, producing an ongoing dialogue that interrogates the notion of freedom, the legitimate scope of government, how to reconcile the individual and the community, and the difficulties faced by government in a multicultural society of individuals who struggle to find a sense of collectivism from which authority can issue for concerted government action. Davis sets out to plumb the depths of Anglo-American conservatism in order to determine in what ways, if any, Anglo-American conservatisms have come to be alike. Comparing Edmund Burke and Russell Kirk and considering important strands of libertarianism, neo-conservatism and contemporary conservative populism, he highlights interesting parallels and an intersecting of ideas.

The second section of the book consists of three chapters that explore the institutions of slavery, empire and international law. In doing so, it engages with two ephemeral issues and what one imagined until recently would be and may still turn out to be a permanent issue. One of the huge, puzzling anomalies of history is the question of how slavery and imperialism could coexist in

societies that espoused the values of liberalism. In the end, they could not and maybe that speaks to our contention that while different political doctrines can coexist in a political tradition, there are limitations to what one can embrace and survive. Slavery clearly falls into the irreconcilable category and eventually prevailing values led to its demise, but how this came about and how each nation conceived of the process says much about the interactions between them. David Ryan makes a similar argument about the anomaly of imperialism; the Anglo-American political tradition and the associated philosophical ideas coexisted with the systemic engagement with imperialism that denied, limited and subverted these ideas elsewhere in the world. It is difficult to determine the extent to which the former relied on the latter; American freedom was very much predicated on various forms of expansion. At the heart of the US Anti-Imperial League was the charge that such expansion subverted US values. But one suspects either the values of liberalism prevail and imperialism expires, or imperialism triumphs, liberalism withers away and the American political tradition changes into something radically different. This would be an existential threat to the Anglo-American political tradition, unless Britain, perhaps carried along by the United States, travelled the same route.

In their examination of slavery, Clive Webb and David Brown explain how the two countries challenged one another by each claiming that their own political culture better embodied the ideals of democracy and individual liberty. This is a story of clashing perspectives, though it is centred on issues that loomed large in each society and that *prima facie* seemed incompatible with democracy. Not surprisingly, they accused each other of hypocrisy. Americans criticized the British for opposing slavery while continuing to assert their imperial dominance over other nations. Conversely, the British attempted to claim the moral high ground by contrasting the supposed benevolence of empire with the barbarism of slavery in the American South. Each country therefore acted as a foil for the other as they competed to assert their moral and political superiority. Webb and Brown's exploration of slavery concludes by showing how the rise of racial Anglo-Saxonism in the late nineteenth century did as much to divide the two nations as it did to unite them.

David Ryan takes up the institution of empire, touched on by Webb and Brown, and explores the similarities and differences between American and British conceptions of empire. He examines the place of empire in both cultures, from denial to acknowledgement to nostalgia, and considers the thinking within the British and American spheres on empire, formal and informal, on civilization and conceptions of barbarism, on progress and order, and on the justifications of and opposition to empire.

David Clinton turns to the broader issue of international law and institutions and identifies three important features that Britain and the United

States seem to have in common, which, as he effectively demonstrates, are not wholly compatible. First, what Arnold Wolfers called the difference between a Continental emphasis on the necessity of the state and an Anglo-American foregrounding of debate about the best way of applying accepted principles of morality to the field of foreign policy. Second, a heightened emphasis on international freedom of action and a corresponding disinclination to subject national decision-making to supranational control. And third, the attitudes towards international law developed by both countries on the basis of being great powers. Taken together, the result has been a sharing of legal tradition that is quite distinctive in nature.

The final section deals with concepts of identity: namely Anglo-Saxonism, the Anglosphere and the special relationship. The first two are obviously closely connected. The racial aspect of Anglo-Saxonism is carefully catalogued by Robert Hendershot through an assessment of the evolving applications of the concept, particularly during and after the Great Rapprochement at the end of the nineteenth century. He reveals how the intersections of nationalism, racism, progressivism and exceptionalism culminated in a unique Anglo-American alliance during the First World War. And while the emphasis on such racial language waned in the mid- and late twentieth century, its legacy endures. David Haglund explains how time mellowed hostile American conceptions of the British as 'the other' and then, in the bitterly contested years of American neutrality (1914–17), a national identity crisis pitted English-Americans against German and Irish Americans. The outcome of this clash of civilizations was the emergence of a widespread identification with inheritances from Britain, which was critical for the eventual emergence of the Anglo-American special relationship, buttressed by what we now refer to as the Anglosphere. However, as he also demonstrates, that Anglosphere is now under threat and may be coming to an end as a result of the damage done during the presidency of Donald Trump. Finally, in his chapter, Steve Marsh considers bilateral Anglo-American summit meetings between prime ministers and presidents to explore the importance of political tradition to the special relationship. First, he examines the discursive construction of the special relationship itself through textual analysis of speeches and commentary around certain summits. Second, he analyses how political traditions are used to justify the special relationship 'in action'. Particular attention is paid to selected wartime summits.

The combined impact of this scholarship strongly suggests that the Anglo-American special relationship is one of deeply embedded ways of thinking, understanding and values. These are at the heart, or indeed are the heart, of the relationship. They conjure up an understanding of the highways and byways of practice that is lacking in many studies on power and interest and

even the immediate reasoning that prompts action. Our understanding of political actions, be they in the economic, social, cultural or defence domain, is given more nuance through a better appreciation of the basis from which political leaders and officials arrive at the decisions they make. Taken together, these chapters do more than complement an understanding of shared security, economic and political interests; they demonstrate the means by which such interests are formulated, articulated and promoted.

Alan P. Dobson, currently Honorary Professor at Swansea University, has held Chairs at Dundee University and St Andrews (honorary) and fellowships at the Norwegian Nobel Institute, Saint Bonaventure University (Lenna), where he held a senior research fellowship, and Baylor University (Fulbright). He has written extensively on Anglo-American relations, international civil aviation and the Cold War strategic embargo. His most recent book is *A History of International Civil Aviation* (Routledge, 2017). He is currently working on a book about the United States, Britain and Canada at the Chicago International Civil Aviation Conference 1944. In 2014, he won the Virginia Military Institute's Adams Centre annual Cold War Essay prize. He founded the Transatlantic Studies Association in 2002 and chaired it until 2013 and is editor of both the *Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, which he founded in 2003, and the *International History Review*.

Steve Marsh is Reader in International Politics at Cardiff University, United Kingdom. His principal research interests lie in post-Second World War international politics, with a particular focus on American foreign policy and Anglo-American relations. His latest book, co-edited with Robert M. Hendershot, is *Culture Matters: Anglo-American Relations and the Intangibles of Specialness* (Manchester University Press, 2020).

Notes

1. See chapter 1 by Kristin A. Cook.
2. Bodleian Library, MS Wilson, 1263, Transcript of Prime Minister's Q&A session at the National Press Club Luncheon, 31 January 1975.
3. Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1955).
4. Cf. Alan Dobson and Steve Marsh (eds), *Churchill and the Anglo-American Special Relationship* (London: Routledge, 2016).
5. See, for instance, Alison Holmes, 'Transatlantic Diplomacy and "Global" States', in Alan Dobson and Steve Marsh (eds), *Anglo-American Relations: Contemporary Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2013), 105–28.

6. Henry Kissinger, 'Reflections on a Partnership: British and American Attitudes to Postwar Foreign Policy', 10 May 1982, available at https://larouchepub.com/other/2002/2901_kissinger.html.

7. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 5th edn (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973), 6–7.

8. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959).

9. John J. Mearsheimer, 'Structural Realism', in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 79–80.

10. Christopher Thorne, *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain and the War against Japan* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979); C.J. Bartlett, *The Special Relationship: A Political History of Anglo-American Relations since 1945* (London: Longman, 1992); John W. Dumbrell, *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations in the Cold War and After* (London: Macmillan, 2001) and 2nd edn, *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations from the Cold War to Iraq* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006); John Baylis, *Anglo-American Defence Relations 1939–1984* (London: Macmillan, 1984); Ian Clark, *Nuclear Diplomacy and the Special Relationship: Britain's Deterrent and America, 1957–1962* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); Jonathan Colman, 'A "Special Relationship"? Harold Wilson, Lyndon B. Johnson and Anglo-American Relations "at the Summit", 1964–1968' (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); Sylvia Ellis, *Britain, America, and the Vietnam War* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004); Nigel Ashton, *Kennedy, Macmillan and the Cold War: The Irony of Interdependence* (Basingstoke: Palgrave 2002); James Ellison, *The United States, Britain and the Transatlantic Crisis: Rising to the Gaullist Challenge, 1963–68* (Basingstoke, Palgrave, 2007); David Reynolds, 'A "Special Relationship"? America, Britain and the International Order Since the Second World War', *International Affairs* 62(i) (Winter 1985/86), 1–20, and 'Roosevelt, Churchill, and the Wartime Anglo-American Alliance, 1939–1945: Towards a New Synthesis', in Hedley Bull and William Roger Louis (eds), *The Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations Since 1945* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 17–43.

11. Bartlett, *Special Relationship*, 2.

12. Richard Ned Lebow, 'Classical Realism', in Dunne et al., *International Relations Theories* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 59.

13. The English School of IR also comes to mind, with scholars such as C.A.W. Manning, Hedley Bull, Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight trying to bridge the divide between realism and idealism/liberalism. See, for example, Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977).

14. Akira Iriye, 'Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations', *Diplomatic History* 3(2) (1979), 116–18; Thomas Field, 'Transnationalism Meets Empire', *Diplomatic History* 42(2) (2018), 305–34, at 306.

15. Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 21, 60, 371; Thomas Zeiler, 'The Diplomatic History Bandwagon: A State of the Field', *Journal of American History* 95(4) (2009), 1053–73.

16. See Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 3, and Alan P. Dobson and Steve Marsh (eds), *Anglo-American Relations: Contemporary Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 2013), 5–8.

17. Bermuda 2' – Air Services Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, including amendments through 1980, Annex 7, *London Airports*, 69. Copy courtesy of US Department of Transportation. The 1980 amendments are often referred to as Bermuda 2.5.

18. Author interview with Paul Wisgerhof, Director, Office of Aviation Negotiations, US State Department, Washington, DC, 4 April 1991.

19. Author interview with Cyril Murphy, Vice President for International Affairs, United Airlines, Chicago, 1 July 1991.

20. Alan P. Dobson, *Peaceful Air Warfare: The United States, Britain and the Politics of International Aviation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 173–211.

21. Author interview with Paul Gretch, Director of Office of International Aviation, US Department of Transportation, 4 April 1991.

22. C.A.W. Manning, *The Nature of International Society* (London: Bell and Sons, 1962), 123.

23. A.H. Birch, *Representative and Responsible Government* (London: Unwin, 1964).

24. Samuel Beer, *Modern British Politics* (London: Faber and Faber, 1965).

25. Michael J. Oakeshott, *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1991).

26. W.H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition: The Rise of Collectivism*, vol. I (London: Methuen, 1983); W.H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition: The Ideological Heritage*, vol. II (London: Methuen, 1983); W.H. Greenleaf, *The British Political Tradition: A Much Governed Nation*, vol. III (London: Methuen, 1987).

27. R.A.W. Rhodes, *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*, Public Policy and Management (Philadelphia, PA: US Open University, 1997).

28. Mark Bevir and R.A.W. Rhodes, *Interpreting British Governance* (London: Routledge, 2003); Mark Bevir and R.A.W. Rhodes, *Governance Narratives* (London: Routledge, 2006). See also M. Hall, *Political Traditions and UK Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

29. See, for instance, Jeremy Richardson, 'The Changing British Policy Style: From Governance to Government?', *British Politics* 13(2) (June 2018), 215–233; Special Issue of *Governance* 29(4) (2016), 467–571.

30. Sue Davis, *The Political Thought of Elizabeth Stanton: Women's Rights and the American Political Traditions* (New York: New York University Press, 2008); Lisa Page Vetter, *The Political Thought of America's Founding Feminists* (New York: New York University Press, 2017).

31. Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*.

32. See, in particular, Alan P. Dobson, 'Anglo-American Political Culture', in Robert Hendershot and Steve Marsh (eds), *Culture Matters: Anglo-American Relations and the Intangibles of 'Specialness'* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020), 108–30.

33. Rogers M. Smith, *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999).

34. S.N. Eisenstadt, *Tradition, Change and Modernity* (New York: John Wiley, 1973), 139.

35. Stephen Eric Bronner, *Ideas in Action: Political Tradition in the Twentieth Century* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999), 9.

36. Mamina Natalia Alekseevna, 'Political Traditions: The Concept and Structure', *Modern Research of Social Problems* 4 (2013), 366–80.

37. See, for instance, Lee Ward, *The Politics of Liberty in England and Revolutionary America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

Bibliography

- Alekseevna, M.N. 'Political Traditions: The Concept and Structure', *Modern Research of Social Problems* 4 (2013), 366–80.
- Ashton, N. *Kennedy, Macmillan and the Cold War: The Irony of Interdependence*. Basingstoke: Palgrave 2002.
- Bartlett, C.J. *The Special Relationship: A Political History of Anglo-American Relations since 1945*. London: Longman, 1992.
- Baylis, J. *Anglo-American Defence Relations 1939–1984*. London: Macmillan, 1984.
- Beer, S. *Modern British Politics*. London: Faber and Faber, 1965.
- Bevir, M., and R.A.W. Rhodes. *Governance Narratives*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- . *Interpreting British Governance*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Birch, A.H. *Representative and Responsible Government*. London: Unwin, 1964.
- Bronner, S.E. *Ideas in Action: Political Tradition in the Twentieth Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.
- Bull, H. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. London: Macmillan, 1977.
- Clark, I. *Nuclear Diplomacy and the Special Relationship: Britain's Deterrent and America, 1957–1962*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Colman, J. *'Special Relationship'? Harold Wilson, Lyndon B. Johnson and Anglo-American Relations 'at the Summit', 1964–1968*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.
- Davis, S. *The Political Thought of Elizabeth Stanton: Women's Rights and the American Political Traditions*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.
- Dobson, A.P. 'Anglo-American Political Culture', in Robert Hendershot and Steve Marsh (eds), *Culture Matters: Anglo-American Relations and the Intangibles of 'Specialness'*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2020, 108–30.
- . *Peaceful Air Warfare: The United States, Britain and the Politics of International Aviation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991.
- Dobson, A.P., and S. Marsh (eds). *Anglo-American Relations: Contemporary Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- . *Churchill and the Anglo-American Special Relationship*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Dumbrell, J.W. *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations in the Cold War and After*. London: Macmillan, 2001, and 2nd edn: *A Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations from the Cold War to Iraq*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. *Tradition, Change and Modernity*. New York: John Wiley, 1973.
- Ellis, S. *Britain, America, and the Vietnam War*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.
- Ellison, J. *The United States, Britain and the Transatlantic Crisis: Rising to the Gaullist Challenge, 1963–68*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2007.
- Field, T. 'Transnationalism Meets Empire', *Diplomatic History* 42(2) (2018), 305–34.
- Greenleaf, W.H. *The British Political Tradition*, 3 vols. London: Methuen, 1983 and 1987.
- Hall, M. *Political Traditions and UK Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Hartz, L. *The Liberal Tradition in America*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1955.
- Hofstadter, R. *The American Political Tradition and the Men Who Made It*. New York: Vintage Books, 1948.
- Hollis, M., and S. Smith. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Holmes, A. 'Transatlantic Diplomacy and "Global" States', in A.P. Dobson and S. Marsh (eds), *Anglo-American Relations: Contemporary Perspectives*. London: Routledge, 2013, 105–28.

- Iriye, A. 'Culture and Power: International Relations as Intercultural Relations', *Diplomatic History* 3(2) (1979), 116–18.
- Lebow, R.N. 'Classical Realism', in T. Dunne et al., *International Relations Theories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016, 58–77.
- Manning, C.A.W. *The Nature of International Society*. London: Bell and Sons, 1962.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 'Structural Realism', in T. Dunne, M. Kurki and S. Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, 79–80.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. 5th edn. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1973.
- Oakeshott, M.J. *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 1991.
- Reynolds, D. 'A "Special Relationship"? America, Britain and the International Order since the Second World War', *International Affairs* 62(i) (Winter 1985/86), 1–20.
- _____. 'Roosevelt, Churchill, and the Wartime Anglo-American Alliance, 1939–1945: Towards a New Synthesis', in H. Bull and W.R. Louis (eds), *The Special Relationship: Anglo-American Relations Since 1945*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986, 17–43.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*. Public Policy and Management. Philadelphia, PA: US Open University, 1997.
- Richardson, J. 'The Changing British Policy Style: From Governance to Government?', *British Politics* 13(2) (June 2018), 215–233. Also in special Issue of *Governance* 29(4) (2016), 467–571.
- Smith, R.M. *Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in U.S. History*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Thorne, C. *Allies of a Kind: The United States, Britain and the War against Japan*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979.
- Vetter, L.P. *The Political Thought of America's Founding Feminists*. New York: New York University Press, 2017.
- Waltz, K.M. *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Ward, L. *The Politics of Liberty in England and Revolutionary America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Wendt, A. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Zeiler, T. 'The Diplomatic History Bandwagon: A State of the Field', *Journal of American History* 95(4) (2009), 1053–73.