

positioning in Japan] / A. Lenin // Rossiiskaya Gazeta RG.RU. 2020. 10 yanvaria. Retrieved from: <https://rg.ru/2020/01/10/moskva-i-tokio-ne-prodvinulis-v-dialoge-po-razmeshcheniiu-pro-v-iaponii.html>

Anastasiia Shevchenko

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University

Vinnitsia

Research Supervisor: M.I. Prykhnenko, PhD in Political Science, Senior Lecturer

Language Advisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, PhD in Philology, Senior Lecturer

“SPECIAL RELATIONS” AS AN ELEMENT OF BRITAIN’S FOREIGN POLICY TRADITION

Introduction. Researchers have different interpretations of the existence of such phenomenon as “special (Anglo-American) relations”, arguing that they are mostly not “special”, but simply formed as a permanent choice of Great Britain between the European and American policy vectors. Some argue that choosing between America and Europe is wrong decision, and “special relations” just have been strengthened by the fight against terrorism since 9/11. However, this article will help to clarify that there are a number of features that have emerged since the end of World War II and shape British foreign policy, actively supporting cooperation with the United States in the framework of “special relations”.

Review of recent publications. Significant contributions to the study were made by scholars such as Brown R., Marsh S., and Baylis J., who traced how “special relations” were formed and retrained in the British foreign policy tradition by analysing vision of British politicians; Wallace W., Phillips Ch. and Allen N., Choy H. emphasized on the current period, focusing on transforming the vision of “special relations” during the rule of D. Trump and J. Biden in the context of BREXIT, and what challenges to Anglo-American relations are presented today and future.

Objectives of the paper. The aim of this study is to analyse the formation and development of such phenomenon as “special relations” in the foreign policy of Great Britain after the World War II: its role and relevance in modern conditions within BREXIT.

Results of the research. The definition of “special relationship”, which means close relations between the British Commonwealth, the British Empire, and the United States was intensified after Churchill’s speech at Fulton in 1946. Its origins were preceded in 1941 with the adoption of eight principles that contributed to world peace and the spread of democracy in the world – the Atlantic Charter.

The United States and the United Kingdom share common historical, cultural, commercial, democratic values and interests. As a result, it is not surprising that Washington and London have begun to work closely together in the international arena. But events such as the 1956 Suez Crisis, considered the lowest point of the

relationship, demonstrated that “special relationships” were going through difficult and sometimes contradictory moments. The 1960s and 1970s proved idealistically hypocritical on the part of the United States to increase military involvement in Vietnam at a time when the United Kingdom was suffering from large-scale decolonization [4].

The situation after the 1980s intensified “special relations” due to the arrival of new leadership. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, M. Thatcher, and the President of the United States, R. Reagan, sought to restore and strengthen the Anglo-American system of thought and interaction, with a strong emphasis on capitalism, free market, and “containment of communism”. This facilitated their struggle, helped tear down the Berlin Wall, and eventually led to the end of the Cold War. The parties actively supported each other during military operations: there are Britain – Falkland Islands in 1982 and the United States – Libya in 1986.

At the same time, such ideological prospects could not avoid a number of obstacles: Reagan did not immediately support Britain’s war against anti-communist Argentina, and Thatcher personally flew to Iceland to persuade the US president to retreat and cancel the Reykjavik summit for fear of nuclear disarmament. However, their strong united position hastened the end of the struggle against the Eastern bloc and opened up new opportunities in the Anglo-American system of interaction [5].

1990-2000: B. Clinton and T. Blair demonstrate new idealistic views of the new world order, proclaiming: to support developing countries and open new markets for investment to counter the growing power of authoritarian states under the Atlantic Charter [2].

The events of 9/11 and the arrival of the new President *George W. Bush* united Anglo-American efforts in the fight against terrorism and strengthened the desire to spread democracy, which led to the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq. However, the conflicts dragged on and resulted in severe human and material losses, which left both presidents in office with a contradictory public attitude to the global interventionist policy pursued by previous foreign policy decisions.

“Special Relationships” in 2010: *B. Obama and D. Cameron*. It is worth noting at once that this period can be traced as a moment that could shake the close Anglo-American relations. Even though both sides sought to solve all the problems that arose as a result of the activities of their predecessors, but at the same time they saw ways to overcome them differently.

The crisis in Syria has become a challenge for “special relations”, where the governments of both sides were ready to use military force in response to the use of chemical weapons by Assad. Parliament and Congress opposed the decision, remembering the protracted wars waged by Blair and Bush. In addition, this period is defined as Obama’s request to the United Kingdom to remain in the EU, refusing the referendum: “BREXIT will send Britain in the back in trade negotiations” [2]. Due to the peculiarities of different worldviews and foreign policy, relations between Obama and Cameron have weakened, unlike their predecessors.

“BREXIT” and presidential products in 2016: Although *D. Trump and T. May* shared a common vision of the world that focuses on protecting jobs within states and

the public from terrorism, politicians faced controversy due to the complex nature of the American president [3]. But their relationship has been repeatedly compared to Reagan and Thatcher, believing that there is a similar understanding and level of cooperation between them. Therefore, national interests and a common vision of the world order were given priority, uniting, and strengthening Anglo-American relations.

B. Johnson and J. Biden: The UK is expected to be one of the first foreign destinations on the president-elect's route: "[they need to bury] their differences over Brexit and come to terms with Boris Johnson" [1]. A special step will be a return to the nuclear deal with Iraq (from which the United States withdrew under Trump in 2018) by joining Britain on this issue. But "special relations" can face significant difficulties: the United States under Trump tried to strengthen relations with the United Kingdom, but with J. Biden, British Prime Minister B. Johnson "starts from scratch", where a Democrat can provide priority to relations with Brussels and other European leaders.

The situation remains *ambiguous*: British experts note that there is a shortage of "American leadership" in the world today, due to the severe consequences of COVID-19; in addition, the United States has previously demonstrated the importance of addressing internal issues to external ones. In addition, B. Johnson was "closer in spirit" and vision of foreign affairs D. Trump; J. Biden's victory could return the country to the course of its predecessor B. Obama, which means to the course of rapprochement with Europe. In this case, Britain will remain outside American interests [1].

Conclusion. Thus, analyzing the main characteristics of the development of "special relations" between the United States and Great Britain, it is necessary to highlight several key points:

1. "Special relations" were established as a result of a common vision of the world order and as a result of historical, cultural, trade and democratic values.
2. This phenomenon can be traced back to the proclamation of Fulton's speech by W. Churchill in 1946 and it is considered as one of the priorities of British foreign policy to this day, which has established the status of "element of foreign policy tradition".
3. During the last 70 years, "special relations" have experienced "ups and downs", depending on the views of foreign policymakers who headed the government at one time or another.
4. Today, "special relations" are experiencing "uncertainty" over the change of government in the United States, where the current government may prioritize the European policy vector over Anglo-Saxon.

References

1. Allen N. Joe Biden and the special relationship: What America's new president means for the UK and Brexit / N. Allen // The Telegraph. 21 January 2021.

Retrieved from: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/0/joe-biden-uk-special-relationship-brexite-boris-johnson-2021/>

2. Brown R. A History of the Anglo-American Special Relationship / R. Brown. Ashbrook Statesmanship Thesis Recipient of the 2012 Charles E. Parton Award. 2012. p. 1-59. Retrieved from: <https://www.ashbrook.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/ShermanBrown-Printable.pdf>

3. Choy H. Brexit Britain and Trump America: A New 'Special Relationship'? / H. Choy. News Front. 2017. Retrieved from: <https://en.news-front.info/2017/08/17/brexit-britain-and-trump-america-a-new-special-relationship/>

4. Marsh S., Baylis J. The Anglo-American "Special Relationship": The Lazarus of International Relations / S. Marsh., J. Baylis. Political Science. Democracy and Statecraft. 2006. Retrieve from: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592290500533841>

5. Wallace W., Phillips Ch. Reassessing the special relationship / W. Wallace, Ch. Phillips // International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944). Vol. 85. No. 2 (Mar., 2009), p. 263 – 284.

Karyna Moroz

Vasyl' Stus Donetsk National University

Vinnitsia

Research Supervisor: Y.V. Kotyk, PhD in History, Senior Lecturer

Language Advisor: V.I. Kalinichenko, PhD in Philology, Senior Lecturer

MEDIA AS A MEANS OF INFLUENCING POLITICAL PREFERENCES ON THE AUDIENCE

Introduction. In modern society, the media has become a powerful political institution, without which it is impossible to imagine the actions of public authorities. Electronic media, especially television are of extreme importance nowadays. Thanks to it, public policy has become an extremely effective tool for influencing society, opening up unprecedented opportunities for political orientation and manipulation of public opinion. Therefore, the responsibility of the media to society is growing significantly. The actions of the media in the information space can be reduced to two main types. **The first** is called *mobilization*, which includes incitement and propaganda, and the **second** is called *marketing* and *the use of public relations and political advertising*. Usually both types are used in democratic society, but the other is predominant [3].

Review of recent publications. The media have formed a so-called *media consciousness* that changes public opinion through the manipulative influence and psychological attitude of the media. This effect involves the use of various techniques that exert implicit pressure on the human subconscious. The manipulative influence of social media is achieved through repetition, myth, forgery, concealment of facts and attitudes. In the future, it is best to study the field of media attitude and