



The US and EU Approach to the Brexit

Saeid Khosravi^{1*}, Zahra Emami², Mohammad Taheri³

^{1*}Senior Researcher, Shahid Beheshti School of Governance, Supreme National Defense University, Tehran, Iran

²Master of International Relations, Mofid University of Qom, Qom, Iran

³Master of Political Science, Zahedan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Zahedan, Iran

Received: 10 June 2021 ; Accepted: 18 Sep 2021

Abstract:

With the withdrawal of Britain from the European Union as one of the most important members of the European Union, the strengthening of nationalist views as a factor in shaking the approach to European regional integration disappears. Brexit could be the beginning of the process of withdrawal of the other members of the European Union and its collapse. While the EU has taken steps to maintain its cohesion and meet its security, economic and political challenge, the UK's withdrawal has been welcomed by the US, which some see as a deeper rift between the EU and the US. This article, which has been compiled analytically-descriptively using library resources, seeks to answer the question of what is the US and EU approach to Brexit? In this regard, the article will examine Britain's withdrawal from the Union and the approaches of the United States and the European Union. The findings show that in the Obama era, due to multilateral policies, peaceful relations, cooperation with the European Union in various fields, and the emphasis on the transatlantic treaty, we see disagreement with Britain's withdrawal from the EU, but in the Trump era due to unilateralism policies and Britain's encouragement not to join the EU; On the other hand, the European Union continues to call for the integration and preservation of its members, especially the United Kingdom, for its own economic, political and security interests. The issue of Brexit is one of the causes of divergence between the United States and Europe.

Keywords: Brexit, European Union, US, UK, Divergence

*Corresponding Author's Email: Saeidkhosravi65@gmail.com

Introduction

Boris Johnson and supporters of Brexit claim that it will make Britain younger because, after Brexit from the EU, it will break free from the EU's structural and behavioral constraints and can play a global role as an independent power and pay more action. In the context of British global policy, there is a perception that London could increase its power and influence and gain countless benefits by relieving itself of its EU membership restrictions by communicating independently with other countries and concluding numerous agreements.

Britain can revitalize previous alliances in all regions, establish new partnerships, shape and strengthen bilateral relations according to its interests, and enter into bilateral agreements with other countries according to its system. As a result, the June 23, 2016 referendum in the UK and the overwhelmingly over 51% vote led to Britain seceding from the EU. However, some ambiguities and uncertainties about London's future foreign policy interests have led opponents of Brexit to doubt the success of British policy at home and abroad.

The most important issue in British politics after leaving the European Union is the emphasis and effort on maintaining and enhancing the special relationship with the United States more than ever. It should be noted that although the history of these relations has been influenced by the role of history, culture, race and common language, and co-directional policies, there are doubts as to whether the United States is as dependent on this relationship as Britain. The policy of alliance with the United States in World War II and then to counter the Soviet communist threats, as well as to align with Bush's aggressive foreign policy, can be recalled to call the many periods of relations between the United States and Britain.

However, this cooperation and closeness were not such that Britain sought to leave the European Union, and even after announcing this decision, Barack Obama explicitly stated his opposition and support for staying in the European Union, saying that Britain would be at its best when a strong European Union to guide. However, British decision-makers held a referendum in 2016 to determine Brexit, and Britain must pursue independent relations with other countries in pursuit of its post-election policies. The referendum, which coincided with the run-up to the US presidential election, was backed by Trump and he promised to seek a special relationship with Britain.

This article, which has been compiled analytically and descriptively using library resources, seeks to answer the question of what is the US and EU approach to Brexit? The article hypothesizes that the United States was opposed to the Brexit during the Obama administration but for the Trump administration due to unilateral policies agreed with it, but the European Union still wants to unite and preserve its members, especially Britain, for its economic, political and security interests.

Theoretical Framework

In general, in terms of the level of analysis, three levels should be considered for convergence studies in international relations. State-level convergence refers to the process by which governments transfer part of their decision-making power and authority to supra-national institutions on a global scale, which enhances the efficiency of collective decision-making. For example, the UN can be contracted at this level. The second level is the level of regional convergence, according to which many adjacent states come together

to form a federal political and economic union like the European Union. The third level depends directly on the structural characteristics of states. The higher degree of political, economic, cultural units, etc the greater the impact on convergence (Kiani et al, 2019, p. 60)

Haas, in his book on the European Coal and Steel Community, states that the decision to join or oppose convergence depends on whether the major groups forming a convergence unit see the convergence perspective as fruitful or detrimental; and instead of relying somehow on the convergence plan, which calls for altruistic motives necessary, what seems more reasonable is to look at interests and values that are far more complex than can be expressed in simple terms such as France and Germany wishing for peace or a desire for a united Europe. Haas believes that in the process of learning and adapting power-oriented government activities, they can turn into welfare-oriented actions. When players find that their interests are best served when they turn to a larger organization, then the process of learning and adapting will help converge.

In this way, interests and welfare find another interpretation. The lessons learned from convergence in one functional sector are applied in other sectors as well and ultimately transform international politics. According to Haas, the conflicting theory of horizontal and vertical expansion means what can be called the principle of divergence, which Haas found in his study of the European Coal and Steel Society that among the European elites directly associated with coal and steel, few they supported the community, and only when the community was able to continue to work most of the union and party leaders supported the community, and for the benefit, it already gained in other community-building efforts in Europe, including the formation of Common markets were intro-

duced and those who benefited from the existence of transnational institutions in one sector were strongly inclined to advocate convergence in other sectors. Through this process, nations promoted their national interests in a broader convergence environment (Karimipour et al., 2019, p. 312).

Thus, in the international system, as well as at the regional level, countries are in a state of cooperation or conflict or a combination of the two due to their goals, capabilities, and perceptions of various issues. Just as various factors and contexts lead to the development of cooperation, and convergence alliances between countries, different factors also lead to competition, conflict, and divergence between countries. Inequality of power and lack of political, economic, cultural, and security integration have a significant impact on escalating differences between countries and can provide grounds for divergence. In general, some divergence factors in conflict over national interests, filling the power vacuum in the revised region, conflict for supremacy, they know ideological conflict, and economic competition (Azghandi and Agha Alikhani, 2013, p. 227).

Conditions for leaving the European Union

If we divide the process of convergence in the European Union into two periods, the Cold War and after the Cold War, during the Cold War the process of convergence in Europe was affected by the competition between East and West, and each of the two powers sought to expand their influence in the world. Following the rise of communism in Europe and the United States, the Soviet Union sought to influence communism. Europe was divided between two poles. Eastern Europe came under Communism and Western Europe came under the domination of capitalism and the United States.

Given the position of Western Europe in the Western bloc, any success in the process of convergence in Western Europe was considered by Soviet politicians to be synonymous with efforts to weaken communism; But the United States, with economic and military assistance in the form of the Marshall Plan and NATO, had a significant impact on the integration process. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the decline of its power reduced the power of interventionism in Europe, but the United States, as the dominant power in the international system, will continue to have a positive impact on Europe. The continuation of the process of convergence in the Union has challenged the interests and supremacy of the United States, as can be seen in the Iraq War (2003). For this reason, the United States has thwarted any purely Europe-centric movement in various ways, using ideas such as "New Europe versus Old Europe." American neoconservatives believe that Islam and China are not the only challenges to US power, but that increasing the EU's influence without coordination with Washington could weaken the United States. As for the withdrawal of members from the European Union, Article 50 of the Lisbon Treaty is as follows:

1. Any member state of the European Union may decide to leave the Union following its constitution.
2. Any Member wishing to secede from the Union shall inform the Council of the European Union of its intention. The Union should, using the guidelines and guidelines of the Council of the European Union, begin negotiations with the requesting Government and conclude an agreement based on which it will consider the necessary arrangements for its withdrawal from the Union and the framework of future

relations with that country. This agreement shall be negotiated under Article 218 of the Treaty, which deals with the role of the Council of Europe. This agreement is concluded by the council and the union after obtaining the approval of the parliament.

3. All treaties of that State shall cease to have effect from the date of entry into force of the Exit Agreement or two years after the date of notification referred to in paragraph 2 for the requesting State Party unless the Council of the European Union unanimously decides to extend this period.
 4. To implement paragraphs 2 and 3, the member of the Council of Europe or an institution whose representative has resigned from the Union shall not participate in the meetings of the Council of Europe or any other decision.
- A qualified majority shall be defined by Section B, paragraph 3, of Article 238 of the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union.
5. A state that has left the union, if it wants to rejoin the union, must follow the mechanism set out in Article 49.

As it can be seen, the withdrawal conditions are easier than the entry conditions, and these conditions are formal and do not refer to the essential conditions. What is seen in the regulations is that any country that intends to leave the Union cannot negotiate through a mechanism outside Article 50 (for example, by severing the accession law 1972 to secede from the Union) and this article has the right to leave is a self-sufficient system; As mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 42 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the termination or rejection of a treaty or the withdrawal of a party from it is done only

based on the provisions of the same treaty or convention of law treaties (Mellat and Abedini, 2017, p. 466).

Referendum

In a survey of citizens in response to the question of whether in the near future you will describe yourself in the form of national, National-European, European-national, or only European, 41.1% only national, 49.8% national and European, 5.9% are European-national and finally, 3.3% are only European. Also, in response to the question of how proud they are of their national unit and Europe, 46.2% are very proud of their national unit versus 17% of Europe. 42.1% are somewhat proud of their national unit and 55.3% of Europe. 9.2% are not very proud of the national unit and 19.4% are not very proud of Europe, and finally, 2.5% are not proud of the national unit versus 8.2% of Europe. (Qavam, 2011, p. 87).

There are several reasons for Britain's reluctance to join European mechanisms: first, its geographical location and its impact on its

history. The British people live on an island in the corner of the European continent that has always been in the heart of the oceans. Hence, the British always refer to Europe as "another place". The second is British history, which is more aligned with other continents. Britain's prominent role in World War II also had a profound effect on this European skepticism. The third is the country's economic position, which has been one of the top and most advanced economies in Western Europe since the mid-1990s, with relatively high growth and low unemployment. The image of the "three circles" presented by Churchill in 1948 and turning it into an important conceptual design for British foreign policy was also a reflection of the idea that Europe had no special place in British foreign policy. The point was that Britain gained its power from participating in these three circles and was still a global power (Naqibzadeh, 2013, pp. 15-16)

The result of the Brexit referendum on 23 June 2016 (percent of participant %72.2)

Countries	Supporters		Opponents	
	Votes	percentage	Votes	percentage
Britain	17410742	51.90	16141241	48.10
England	15188406	53.40	13266996	46.60
Scotland	1018322	38	1661191	62
Wales	854572	52.50	772347	47.50
North Ireland	349442	44.20	440437	55.80

Source: (Salehi et al., 2018, p. 109)

Consequences of Brexit

As a member of the European Union, Britain's foreign relations go beyond foreign and security policy and cover a wider range of areas, including trade, aid, environment, energy, development policy, immigration, borders, asylum, border police, and the judiciary. All of these policies are now intertwined with EU policies. However, in recent

years we have witnessed British efforts to leave the union, which, with President Trump in the United States, has seen his support for the British withdrawal. Britain's leave of the EU represents the prospect of a major rethinking of the goals and ambitions for Britain's place in the world and will have consequences for British diplomacy (Johnson, 2016, p. 2).

However, Britain's foreign, security and defense policy, as a country with considerable diplomatic and military resources has never been pursued exclusively through the European Union, but through a variety of institutions followed (the most prominent of which are the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the United Nations). At the same time, the loss of British diplomatic and military resources to the EU will reduce the collective capabilities of the EU defense and defense policy (Whitman, 2016, p. 44).

Britain's exit from the European Union includes its exit from the common market financial sector. By accepting the European identity, the member states of the European Union renounce their national identity and define a new identity with new interests for themselves. In fact, in most EU countries, the sign of nationalism or national identity is the opposite of Europe. Most EU countries have highlighted the European sign and marginalized the sign of nationalism, except for Britain, which feels geographically and politically different from other members of the EU and insists on British identity. Britain refuses to give up its independence and national identity because of its historical impasse (imperial system and alliance with the Anglo-Saxons) as well as geographical conditions (being an island) and always insists on British identity; Thus, Britain contrasts the European sign with a non-"British identity". "Whenever we need to choose between Europe and the Open Sea, we will choose the high seas," Churchill told de Gaulle in 1994. He also declared at the University of Zurich in September 1946 that he accepted European convergence only for the countries of continental Europe and not for Britain: "Any step that brings Europe closer to success and peace will be in the interests of Britain. But we have our dream and plan. We are always

with Europe, but never part of it. We are in touch with it but we are not a part of it" (Najibzadeh, 2013, p. 21). The vote of the British people to leave the European Union is an example of choosing the paradigm of border control and national sovereignty instead of the paradigm of becoming more value-oriented (Catalinac, 2007, p. 35). Proponents of Brexit believe that Britain is a desirable and unique destination for immigrants and that the British Channel should be integrated with British rationality to prevent a flood of non-Europeans (Portes, 2016, p. 236).

On the other hand, Europe can be considered the birthplace of nationalism. Cultural and international relations between the countries of this region are important elements. Language policy is one of the many topics that show the importance of Britain. English is just one of the Union's 24 official languages. However, despite the equal status of English with other languages in EU official documents, in practice, a very different picture can be obtained with a closer look. English is not only the most widely spoken language in the world but also widely used as an international language, with each country using it as one of its major languages; Therefore, the fate of English is unlikely to change significantly in the post-election scenario (Saraceni, 2017, p. 350).

As a result of the EU referendum in June 2016, a majority of countries noted that there may be a future economic relationship between the UK and the EU and the prospect of a UK trade relationship with those countries outside the EU. However, none of the proposed models for future trade relations between the United Kingdom and the European Union (for example, membership in the European Economic Area or the Free Trade Agreement) is accompanied by a defined foreign and security policy. Article 50 of the EU

Treaty provides for the withdrawal of a member state from the EU but does not provide a roadmap for the new state of foreign policy, security, and defense relations between the EU and its foreign partner (Whitman, 2016, p. 43).

Britain's withdrawal from the European Union has various political, security-military, and economic consequences. Phenomena such as Brexit in Europe seem to indicate that European societies are moving towards redefining identity; Values; capabilities and expectations are moving. On the other hand, with the withdrawal of Britain, the fifth-largest economy in the world, there will be many opportunities to develop its GDP under Brexit. It can negotiate for trade with China, India, Singapore, and the United States and prove itself independently instead of being one of the 28 members of the EU team. In addition, the UK will be relieved of the heavy burden of EU regulation (Haass & Fonte, 2016).

Some countries, such as Germany, are trying to reduce the catastrophic impact of Britain's withdrawal and increase their weight after taking Britain out of the European Union to gain a non-permanent seat on the Security Council. It should be said that the UK's decision to leave the EU has caused a lot of speculation about the future of this country and the EU. At the same time, some of the factors - including the rise of populism - that led to the British referendum and the result in favor of leaving the EU are manifesting themselves in other parts of Europe (Wickett, 2018).

Ted Bremond, an expert on British-American relations, believes that Britain's exit from the EU will have three major implications for American policymakers: Bilateralism with Britain will be essential for the United States. Second, as the United King-

dom regains its freedom to negotiate trade agreements, the United States must seize this opportunity to negotiate a free trade area with the United Kingdom. Third, as Britain regains its democratic national sovereignty, the United States must recognize that it has endorsed the original United Kingdom on which the United States was founded, while the European Union believes that the existence of independent nations is a problem to be solved. (Bromund, 2020)

EU Reaction

As Britain and France hold a permanent seat on the Security Council, this has given the bloc authority in its international relations with other countries, as well as in maintaining international peace and security. Therefore, Britain's withdrawal from the EU could have a devastating effect on the EU's foreign and security policy, because with Britain leaving the EU, only France, which is a permanent member of the UN Security Council on the Green Continent, will have a veto right. On the other hand, this could also increase France's weight in the management of the Union, especially against Germany. On the other hand, a Union without Britain would mean an increase in German influence. Merkel saw Britain's decision to leave as a turning point for the European Union and said Germany had a special responsibility to ensure the success of the bloc; "European leaders will work to reduce unemployment and other issues in the areas of security, economic growth, and migration," said Frank Stein Meier, citing depression and inactivity in the European Union. "We will not allow anyone to take Europe away from us."

These two comments on the eve of the British withdrawal vote show that German officials believe they can handle the economic and trade shocks of the Brexit as previous-

ly thought; But what about political exit? There are undoubtedly concerns about the future of EU integration, especially from France and the Netherlands. How Germany enthusiastically keeps the remaining 27 countries in the union could be a major issue to some extent. The increasing German influence cannot have positive results and may put other countries at odds with Germany. German Foreign Minister Frank-Stein Meier, who called Britain's exit from the European Union "catastrophic," recently announced his country's bid for a non-permanent Security Council seat in 2020-2019 to reduce the catastrophic impact of Britain's exit. In this environment, the European Union will lose its ability to function seamlessly on the world stage, and the result will be the weakening of Europe.

Also, the European Union does not command any army, navy, or air force (Chegenizadeh and Esmaili Ardakani, 2017, p. 322); Brexit, therefore, provoked reactions in the European Union. In this regard, new initiatives have been proposed in the field of defense of the European Union. Germany and France are the main players in this initiative. The ideas of the two governments are presented in a six-page article. The proposals of France and Germany have given more impetus to the ideas contained in the new EU global strategy to further develop defense cooperation between EU member states. The proposals of France and Germany include components that indicate a significant departure from the current EU defense arrangements. The French-German proposal could provide the EU with the capacity of a command center to coordinate medical assistance, and a logistics center for the sharing of strategic assets (Whitman, 2016, p. 45).

In general, Brexit has attracted the attention of European political elites, because it is

one of the socio-political changes in European societies that is shaping a new trend in Europe. According to researchers, the negative effects of Brexit on the European Union in the political field, in addition to losing the position of the European Union and disrupting the dynamics of its domestic policy, encourage the current Euroscepticism. The economic consequences of the Brexit were immediately reflected in the EU Trade Agreement with Canada and the US-EU Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Britain's strong economic and political ties with the United States mean that the treaties, even if they continue without Britain, have a harder way of being accepted by the US Congress. In this case, too, there will be further damage to the EU investment sector (Oliver, 2016, p. 224).

The decision of the British people to leave the European Union could also put the issue of Scottish independence on the agenda. Many people in Scotland are seeking independence for EU membership. The United States is also embroiled in controversy in Scotland as it could lead to its inability to deploy nuclear and submarine weapons in Scotland. Britain's withdrawal from the EU and Scotland's withdrawal from Britain are likely to increase tensions in Northern Ireland between pro-British unions and Republicans and nationalists seeking to join Ireland (Haass & Fonte, 2016).

American Reaction

The United States began "moving away from Europe" under President George W. Bush, and continued to do so under Obama. For many Europeans, it has long been clear that Trump's policies in Europe have similar features. The EU leadership believes that the British will soon realize that it is impossible to maintain the current "world order" (Ka-

domtsev, 2020). In the meantime, it must be said that the US approach to the election under Obama and Trump is different and has been different in their approaches.

Obama in some ways supported Britain's non-exit from the European Union, while Trump has sided with Britain from the outset, leading to divergence in US-EU relations. The United States has long advocated British membership in the European Union, calling it a friendly and united voice by the United States. That is why Obama said Britain would not be comfortable living outside the European Union and that the United States would not rush into a trade deal with Britain. Meanwhile, other EU countries such as Germany tried to take advantage of this situation and increase their position with the United States (Mokhtari, 2017, p. 117).

However, geopolitically and economically, the United States is potentially the biggest winner of the EU's disintegration. When the Europeans fought each other and their empires collapsed, the United States came to world domination. The role of the United States after 1945 was first challenged by the Soviet Union, which for a time was a real technological challenge (Johnson, 2016).

With Trump in power, differences between the EU and the United States over world affairs have widened. Trump's policy toward US allies, especially the European Union, is based on economic rationality and profit and loss, and this has created a rift between the two traditional allies. Contrary to former US President Barack Obama, Trump made a special trade offer with Britain after his election. With the election of Trump, the implementation of the "Transatlantic Partnership and Investment Partnership" between the United States and Europe was challenged. "While the main policy of the United States since the Cold War has been to maintain the

unity and integrity of the European Union" (Special Report 2016, p. 13).

In total, there are several parallel policies between Britain and the United States, including the 2016 referendum in Britain and the result that Britain's withdrawal from the European Union and the election of President Donald Trump in the United States is one of the last (Wilson, 2017, pp. 543 -544). The economic cost of choosing between the United States and Britain is proportional to the extent of their economic relationship. The UK is the seventh-largest US trading partner and is also a popular US destination for overseas investment. Nevertheless, American companies operating in the UK operate in areas threatened by the consequences of withdrawal.

In general, Obama believed that Britain's decision to leave the EU would raise long-term concerns about the growth of the global economy, and did not support Britain's exit from the EU. While Trump has supported Britain's withdrawal from the union since the beginning of the election, nevertheless, in recent years (2019 and 2020), Trump's position on the Brexit has been different. "We cannot have a trade deal with Britain because I think we can get a lot more than you do in the EU," he said. In August 2019, however, Trump said he would make a "very big trade deal" with Britain and predicted that the country's exit from the EU would be like "breaking the chains." This shows the difference between the views of Obama and Trump on the issue of Brexit, which according to the doctrines of Obama's multilateralism and Trump's unilateralism can be analyzed as such that in the Trump era we see a kind of divergence between the US and the EU in this regard.

A survey of the relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States shows

that the two countries have had many convergences and collaborations, especially since World War II. As mentioned, Britain is mentioned as the successor to the United States in the European Union. For this reason, a separate study of the convergence of the United Kingdom and the United States and their relations in recent years is of particular importance. One of the important topics in the European policy of the United States during the Cold War was special relations with Britain, which used its position in European equations (Khalouzadeh, 2010, pp. 248-249).

In this regard, we can also refer to the events after the Cold War. The events of 9/11 were an opportunity for Tony Blair and his foreign policy plan to consolidate the strained relations between Britain and the United States. "9/11 was not an attack on the United States, it was an attack on all of us" (Blair, 2002). "We have no better friend in the world than Britain," Bush said during the US-led invasion of Afghanistan. I have no better friend than Tony Blair and I always want to share our concerns with him. Blair is the embodiment of judgment" (Bush, 2001). These words and cooperation led to the cooperation of the United States and Britain in the war against Afghanistan. The United States and Britain have always been strategic allies, to the extent that analysts have called the relationship "special relations" between the two countries; however, in some cases, the analysis suggests that some of the differences between the parties have undermined these "special relationships."

It should be noted that this convergence has also been different in some periods and different periods of the presidency in the United States. For example, in the case of Brexit, which is related to the presidency of Obama and Trump in the United States, the

US approach to this issue has been somewhat different. In this context, we can refer to Obama's visit to the United Kingdom, which took place in 2016, and to be effective in the results of the referendum on Britain's exit from the European Union in favor of supporters of continued membership in the Union and re-emphasis on strategic relations between the two countries; but the point that shows the commitment to cooperation and convergence between the two countries is that, despite Obama's rebuke of the United Kingdom over the Libyan crisis, he reaffirmed the closeness of relations between the two countries.

Obama's concern was not unrelated to the uncertainties of the British decision in the post-election period; because the US government believed that if Brexit happens, its influence in the European Union would be reduced; but the British were trying to convince the Americans of the fact that Britain was both willing and able to respond to American doubts about the Brexit and continuation of the special relationship and its commitments. Although the outspoken stance of US officials had raised serious concerns for proponents of special relations in Britain, nevertheless, with the Brexit victory, the British witnessed an unimaginable turn in the statements and views of US officials (Dyer et al., 2016, p. 26).

Given the history of relations between the two countries and the election of Trump in the United States, two important aspects were considered in the relations between the two countries, which are mutual and effective guarantees in the special relationship, as well as Britain's adherence to its commitments in cooperation between the two countries, it was smaller in that relationship, it came back; because Britain's plans in the post-election period were vague for the United States; so

Terza Mai went to the United States as the first European official to congratulate Trump on his election in January 2017. "This is our first meeting, so it's a great honor," Trump said. The special relationship between the two countries has been one of the most important positive points in history in terms of justice, peace, and friendship.

Today, the United States is reviving its long-standing friendship with Britain. Both countries will forever commit to such a relationship. The two succeed together and the rule of law is established in them. Our relationship has never been stronger than it is now (Trump, 2017). At first glance, Trump's trade and cultural ties with Britain, his support for Brexit, and the wave of joint political discontent between Britain and Trump's supporters have all led to the two countries becoming political allies again. However, Trump and Theresa May disagree on many issues. During an official meeting in the US capital in 2017, Donald Trump and Theresa May stressed that "despite much disagreement, London and Washington want to maintain strong ties." With the election of Boris Johnson as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, relations between the two countries began to improve.

During a visit to Britain, Trump's national security adviser announced a proposal for a free trade agreement between the United States and Britain to support Britain after leaving the European Union. Earlier, Trump had said that after the establishment of trade relations between Britain and the United States, it could be three or four times what it is now (Aqaei, 2019, Fararo News Agency). Thus, British foreign policymakers are trying to demonstrate Britain's commitment to the continuation of the special relationship and hope to show their influence and role in the post-Brexit period by receiving concessions

from the United States and expanding their position and influence in the field, providing the international community with the opportunity to work with the United States to achieve its original policies.

The most recent case of convergence in British-US relations was the seizure of Iranian oil tankers in the Gibraltar region. The British Navy seized an oil tanker carrying about two million barrels of Iranian oil in the waters between Britain and Spain in the Gibraltar region. This action of the United Kingdom is of great importance due to the hostile approach of the United States against Iran and the explosion of oil tankers in the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman in a way referred to it as Britain's confrontation with Iran on behalf of the west (Noorani, 2019, Strategic institute of Tabien).

Since this incident happened at a time when Iran is facing oil sanctions from the United States, in general, in the analysis of the relations between the United Kingdom and the United States, it should be said that the two countries have many commonalities in different fields, which are also evident in the speeches of the British officials. However, it must be said that during Theresa's presidency, we saw more differences in US-British relations on various issues; but with the election of Boris Johnson, who is known as Trump of England, we see more connections between the two countries, which shows the convergence of these two countries.

Conclusion

Britain's withdrawal from the EU following a referendum in 2016 had political, economic, and social consequences for the EU and Britain. While the world seemed to be crossing the borders of the national government towards regional and supra-regional institutionalization and was hailed as a successful

symbol of convergence from the European Union, Britain's exit from the EU shocked and confused many. Can this union be considered a model of convergence or not? As one of the world powers, Britain is trying to advance its national interests after leaving the European Union and becoming the most important partner of the United States.

Proponents of leaving the EU argue that leaving the EU would give Britain more leeway to establish bilateral relations with different countries independently and that it would no doubt not consider reducing its ties with the United States after Britain leaves the EU. The United States, especially since the beginning of the Cold War, has been overwhelmed. Given Britain's intentions to leave the European Union, and given the dependencies and relations between the two sides in the post-Brexit period, without the presence of the United States, Britain will not be able to move in the direction of its global policies.

In this way, Britain will make great efforts to maintain the relationship; on the other hand, the withdrawal of Britain caused the European Union to lose a strong partner and cooperation in the fields of counter-terrorism, economy, NATO, helping to resolve global and regional crises, military, diplomatic and ... cooperation. Therefore, the members of the European Union have tried to build more cohesion and continuous cooperation by relying on other powerful members.

Opponents of Brexit, meanwhile, say Britain will suffer huge losses as it leaves the European Union and may not be able to take appropriate action for years to make up for the loss. In addition, Trump's realist approach to the "First America" slogan, which is in the interests of the United States, could overshadow US cooperation with Britain, and even Britain may conclude that it cannot fill some of its gaps through the United States in the

post-Brexit period. The US threats to withdraw from the regional and international organizations and the abrogation of treaties is reflected in unilateralism and non-liberal and multilateral policies.

In recent years, the US government has raised concerns about EU countries, especially the United Kingdom, by imposing tariffs on exports from partner countries, so Britain's future role in regional and international cooperation with the United States cannot be a real partner, some believe that this trend will prevent the weight and position of Britain as the most important strategic partner of the United States, towards the convergence of Britain, and London will not be able to achieve the special relationship it had and will weaken Britain. Thus, the decline of Britain's position and role in the European Union, and its declination as an independent country in the world will affect its strategic goals and interests.

References

- Aghaei, Seyed Davood (2019). "Perspectives on British-American Relations after Boris Johnson", August 20, published in Fararo News Agency, news code: 409114.
- Azghandi, Alireza; Agha Alikhani, Mehdi (2013). A Study of Regional Factors of Divergence in Iran-Saudi Arabia Relations (2005-2011), *Quarterly Journal of Politics*, Volume 43, pp. 225-243
- Blair, Tony (2002). Prime minister speech at George Bush Senior presidential library, available at: <http://fco.gov.uk/files/kfile/appendixok.132.htm>
- Bromund, TED (2020). Brexit's Three Key Implications for U.S. Policymakers, accessed: January 31, 2020, available

- at:
<https://www.heritage.org/europe/report/brexits-three-key-implications-us-policymakers>
- Bush, George (2001). U.S President Speech at White House, available at: www.state.gov/pub/president/files/speech/2001/32.html
- Catalinac, Amy L., (2007). "Identity Theory and Foreign Policy", *Politics & Policy*, Vol. 35, No. 1, in:
- Chegeni Zadeh, Gholam Ali; Esmaili Ardakani, Ali (1396), German Foreign Policy in the Light of Immigration, Asylum and British Exit from the European Union 2008 to 2016, *Quarterly Journal of Strategic Policy Research*, Year 6, Issue 23, Winter 2017.
- Dyer, Geoff/Sevastopulo, Demetri/Lynch, David J. (2016). UK-US Special Relationship Shaky Following Brexit Vote, *Financial Times*, 26 June 2016, available at: <https://www.ft.com/content/0c71dc88-3b8b-11e6-9f2c-36b487ebd80a>.
- HAASS, RICHARD N., FONTE JOHN (2016). Brexit: Good for the United States? accessed 2016/06/15 available at: <https://www.the-american-interest.com/2016/06/15/brexit-good-for-the-united-states/>
- Johnson, B. (2016). Speech to the Conservative Party Conference, Birmingham, 2 October, available at: <http://blogs.spectator.co.uk/2016/10/full-text-boris-johnsons-conference-speech/>, accessed 10 October 2016
- Johnson, Simon (2016). This is how the US could benefit from Brexit, accessed 27 Jun 2016, available at: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/06/this-is-how-the-us-could-benefit-from-brexit/>
- Kadomtsev, Andrei (2020). Britain after Brexit: Between US and EU, accessed February 10, 2020, available at: <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2020/02/10/britain-after-brexit-between-us-and-eu/>
- Karimi pour, Yadollah; & et. al. (2019). Considering the Convergence and Divergence of Iran and Saudi Arabia in the Framework of Peace Geography, *Quarterly Journal of New Attitudes in Human Geography*, Year 11, Issue 4, Fall 2017, pp. 324-307
- Khalouzadeh, Saeed, (2010). European Union Common Foreign Policy, in *European Union, Identity, Security and Politics*, Tehran: Research Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Kiani, Javad; & et. al. (2017). A Study of Convergence Factors in Iran-Pakistan Relations and Its Impact on Border Security, *Quarterly Journal of Political Research in the Islamic World*, Year 9, Issue 2, Summer 2017, pp. 78-53
- Mellat, Mohammad Reza; Abedini, Abdullah, (2017). International Legal Implications of Britain's exit from the European Union, *Quarterly Journal of Public Law Studies*, Volume 74, Number 2, Summer 2017, pp. 479-459
- Mokhtari, Masoumeh (2017). "The Impact of Brexit (British Exit) on the Political and Economic Convergence of the European Union", Allameh Tabataba'i University, Faculty of Law and Political Science, Department of Regional Studies, European Orientation, M.A. Thesis.

- Naqibzadeh, Ahmad and Homoei, Fatemeh, (2013). England and Europe, Foreign Policy Discourse Analysis (Laclau and Moff Model), *International Political Research Quarterly*, No. 14, Spring 2013
- Nourani, Mahmoud (2019). "Iranian oil tanker confiscated in Gibraltar; Requirements for the Future ", published in Tebyan Strategic Institute, August 6, News-ID: 33317.
- Oliver, Tim (2016). "Goodbye Britannia? The International Implications of Britain's Vote to Leave the EU," *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations* 8(2): 214– 233.
- Omidi, Ali; Aslani Slamers, Abed (2009), *EU Convergence Lessons for ECO, Bi-Quarterly Program and Budget*, No. 109, pp. 38-3
- Portes, J (2016). Immigration, Free Movement and the UK Referendum, *NIESR Review* 236
- Qavam, Seyyed Abdul Ali; Kiani, Davood (2011). *European Union; Identity, political security*; Research Institute for Strategic Studies
- Salehi, Hamid; Nazarian, Abuzar; Nazarian, Nasser (2018). The Impact of Brexit on British Domestic and Foreign Policy, *Political Strategy Summer* 1397 - No. 5, pp. 131-101
- Saraceni, Mario (2017). Post-Brexit English: A post-national perspective, *World English*, pages 250-251. 0883-2919 doi: 10.1111/weng.12271
- Special Report, (2016). *Future Policy Organization Rethinking our world*. Available at: <https://fpoglobal.com/control/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Trump-Foreign-Policy-Challenges.pdf>.
- Trump, Donald, (2017). PM Press Conference with US President Donald Trump, 27 January, available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-press-conference-with-us-president-donald-trump-27-january-2017>
- Whitman, Richard G (2016). *THE UK AND EU FOREIGN, SECURITY AND DEFENCE POLICY AFTER BREXIT: INTEGRATED, ASSOCIATED OR DETACHED? the UK and EU foreign, security and defense policy after Brexit: integrated, associated or detached*, page 43-50
- Wickett, Xenia (18 JUN 2018). *Transatlantic Relations: Converging or Diverging*, available at: <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2018/01/transatlantic-relations-converging-or-diverging-0/3-drivers-divergence-or-convergence?>
- Wilson, Graham K. (2017). "Brexit, Trump and the special relationship", *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, Vol. 19(3) 543–557.