The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Mentouri University, Constantine

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English

Blair's Political Reforms and the

Question of Governance

A dissertation submitted to the Department of English in partial fulfillment for
the Degree of Master in British and American studies

By

BENMECHERI Amina

Supervised by:

Pr. HAROUNI Brahim

June 2010

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER ONE: Tony Blair and the New Labour

CHAPTER TWO: The Third Way

CHAPTER THREE: Modernising Government

DEDICATION

To the memory of my father

<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</u>

I am heartily thankful to my supervisor, Pr Harouni Brahim, whose encouragement, guidance and support from the initial to the final level enabled me to develop an understanding of the subject.

 I would like also to express my sincere gratitude to all my teachers of Civilisation and Literature.

My sincere thanks also go to my family: my parents for giving birth to me at the first place and supporting me morally throughout my life.

Last but not least, I would like to thank all my friends.

ملخص :

يحاول هذا البحث تسليط الضوء على الاصلاحات السياسية التي باشرها رئيس الوزراء البريطاني طوني بلير في الفترة1997, 2007.

استهل بلير اصلاحاته باحداث تغيرات مهمة على بنيات وبرامج حزب العمال الذي بات يعرف بحزب العمال الجديد ولما وصل بلير الى السلطة عام 1997 كان هدفه يتمثل في اعادة تحديث المملكة المتحدة .

Abstract :

This research tries to highlight the political reforms instituted by the British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, from 1997 to 2007.

Blair's reforms initiated important changes in the structures and programmes of the labour Party that became known as the "new labour". Blair's goal was to modernize the United Kingdom.

Résumé:

Cette étude tente de mettre la lumière sur certaines reformes politiques prônées et décidées par Tony Blair Premier Ministre Britannique lors de son mandat 1997-2007.

Cet homme politique et leader du parti travailliste contre vents et marées et toute opposition des autres courants saura instaurer ces importants changements. Son fameux programme connu sous le nom de « Néo-travailliste » verra son application une fois Tony Blair au pouvoir en 1997. Son but sera celui de moderniser le Royaume Unis encore attaché aux tabous des conservateurs.

Introduction

"Today, we are charged with the deep responsibility of government. Today, enough of talking, it is time now to do" (Blair, 65).

After eighteen years in the wilderness, the Labour party was back without question with its majority of 197seats, not the Labour of beer and sandwiches, but "New Labour" of claret and Cool Britannia. By dragging Labour back to the political center. Blair and his allies hoped not only to win the election, but also to make it once again a stable party of government in the eyes of electorate, and they think that Britain deserved better, and especially with Blair leading the way, "New Labour" was going to make Britain great again.(Bewes,33)

Our starting point is that Blair carried through the programme of constitutional reforms he had inherited from John Smith, and reversed the damage that Thatcher had done to Britain's relationship with the rest of the European continent. Therefor , this research tries to provide concise ideas on the main issue during Blair's administration with taking in consideration the widespread of changes and reforms that have taken place since the general election of 1997, and discussing a series of current questions in British politics related to the view of this reform.

It was clear from the begning that Blair is a deeply conformist man, more conformist than Major and much more conformist than Thatcher. But it is almost a law of British politics that Labour prime ministers are more conformist than Conservative ones, so there was nothing mostly surprising about that.

This work attempts to answer the following questions: Did Blair introduce reforms that were of different in extent or nature from the previous reforms? How far Labour's political reforms reflect a change in the way in which the United Kingdom is governed?

The path of this study includes three main chapters. The first chapter begins with the historical background of Tony Blair and the "New Labour", focusing upon his new style in politics and he becomes as Prime Minister in Power. Then the chapter moves to discover the facts of the Labour's party triumph in the 1997 general election and his strategy as Prime Minister.

The Third Way philosophy seeks to adapt enduring progressive values to the new challenges of the Information Age. A significant examination of the idea of modernising Social democracy and constructing the Third Way is the issue of the second chapter which gives also a detailed analysis of how modernisation takes its path and that by putting the "New" into "New Labour" in order to creating a modrnising governance.

With deepness investigation about modernising government is discussed in the third and last chapter of this research which comes up to identify the politics of reforms and discussing the politics of devolution and the Blair government's on devolution reform. The chapter also discusses the idea of a United Kingdom or a Federal Kingdom that does mirror the British society during Blair's premiership.

In this research, Blair's political reforms and administration are offered in another way; through little, but realistic accounts. it is written in an analytic way rather than a descriptive one with an addition of some information and explanation of ideas and theories and new political terms. These are showed by the statistics of their first appearance and distincted in a separate endnotes register at the end of each chapter. Also a full list of references that can be found in the end of the research.

Concerning the sources that I used in this research for the study contain specialised books by famous writers who are specialized in politics. Other practical sources like recent articles published in magazines, journals, and newspapers.

In short, the principal goal of this research is to expose the main point of my work that is the New Labour and the question of governance, by enduring political debates about the British democracy and the quick charge of political reforms tried under the Labour government.

CHAPITER ONE:

Tony Blair and the New labour

Introduction

"I didn't come into politics to change the Labour party. I came into politics to change the country." (Tony Blair, speech at Labour party annual conference.1995).

After the changes produced by the Thatcher and Regan of United states governments, Tony Blair set out a vision of the future based on re-articulation of the language of community and citizenship, reciprocity and responsibility, justice and fairness. In the first part of this chapter, we examine the new style of Tony Blair and the New Labour in politics and how he becomes a Prime Minister in power. The second part of the chapter will be about the massive victory of the Labour party in 1997election and the last part of the chapter will be about Blair's strategy to show us the practices of Blair's democracy which developed real techniques of manipulation.

1- Tony Blair's New style in politics

Tony Blair was born on the 6th May 1953, he was British Prime Minister from 1997 to 2007.He won general elections in 1997, 2001 and 2005, thus first two ones by total victory. Internationally, he was best known for his close deal with presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush of the United States, making the United Kingdom a solid partner in the American-led war in Iraq. Blair led NATO action in Kosovo, and supported international concern about the state of Africa, which he famously called "a scar on the conscience of the world"(Norman, 25)

Domestically, with his coming, he brought the ending of the historic Socialist promise to state ownership of major industries as an essential principle of his "New" Labour Party, with the creation of devolved government in Scotland and Wales, and a victorious end to the armed conflict in Northern Ireland. The term Blairism flourished with the series of policies that he introduced, involving a concern for social questions united with market based on economic policy, by giving importance to the economic ambition of the individual. After ten dramatic years of controversy and mixed success, Blair came into office on a sign of public hopefulness, he ended his run with a low standing in public trust (Watt, 3).

In June 2007, He resigned from both office and Parliament by giving over to his long time opponent and partner Gordon Brown. Now he is an envoy for the Quartet on the Middle East, working to bring about a "two-state" solution to the conflict between Israel and Palestine, also acting as adviser to different organizations (Clegg, 8).

1.1 Tony Blair: a Prime Minister

In 1983, Blair was elected to parliament as the member for Sedgefield , a mining constituency in the north of England; at the age of 30 years, he was the youngest Labour MP of that time. The 1983 Labour policy was considered a one of the most left division that included promises to nationalise large parts of industry. It also included proposals for independent nuclear disarmament and to leave the European Community. After entering Parliament, Blair led a delegation of mine workers and their families to London, where he joined Arthur Scargill [1], in order of requesting the NCB about the planned closure of coke works. However, Blair did not hide his belief that the Labour party had to expand its appeal to middle class voters if it was still to recover power (Bill, Kvanagh, 328).

In the northern *Echo* newspaper, Blair argued that "to win power for the low-paid, unemployed in the north, we must also appeal to the 60% of the population in private housing, to the employed on the average wage and to the south" (55). He considered that as a non popular message for everyone in the Labour party.

After the sudden death of his predecessor John Smith[2], Tony Blair was elected as the leader of the Labour party in July 1994. A year after and in 1995, he convinced the party to revise its constitution; the annual Clause Four(IV)[3], that had been drafted by Sidney Webb[4] which considered as a party policy since 1918 and because of this redrafting a radical break was marked with traditional policies and led to the birth of what Tony Blair called "New Labour", in order of promising nationalisation even if it was generally considered as a style without realistic goal and which was regarded a a major issue in the electoral unpopularity of the Labour party (Brukley, 62).

During Thatcher domination, the conservative party won four successive general elections in 1979, 1983 and 1987 under Thatcher and in 1992 under John Major, while the

Labour was seen as unelectable as long as it retained close relation with the trade union movement and adopted the rhetoric of the second world war socialism. After the years of Thatcher's government, Blair consequently put out to assure a country in which there had been a wide increase in property ownership. So the conservative governments were obliged to keep low taxes which led to growing discontent with the low level of investment in public services, especially in education and health. Tony Blair broke this dissatisfaction and the increasing agitation about what the media represented as satisfaction within the conservative party. In other words "New Labour" was first termed as an option making for the labour party, dating from a conference slogan which was used first by the Labour party in 1994 and which was seen later in an outline manifesto published by the party in 1996, called "New Labour"or as they called it "New life for Britain." It is true that is new life but it was a continuation of the movement or the development that had begun under the leader ship of Neil Kinnock[5]. So officially "New Labour" as a name has no administrator position, but what's left in general use to differentiate modernisers from those investment to more traditional position and that referred to the "old Labour".Blair also revised party policy in a way that improved the image of the Labour party as an experienced and modern, as I said is to differentiate the party from its past.

The new Labour won a massive victory in the 1997 general election putting an end to the long period of conservative domination. The labour party is a democratic socialist party; this means that they believe in what they achieve with each other more than what they achieve alone which give them power, wealth and opportunity in the hands of the many, not the few. In short, where the rights they enjoy reflect the duties they owe, and where they live together , freely, in a spirit of solidarity, tolerance and respect.(Blair,160)

Peter Hennessy, the doyen of British prime ministerial study, commented that "Tony Blair's style of government has been so full of paradox and controversy."(6)

Despite the fact that structural, institutional and contextual factors are important also we can say that individual prime minister's personalities, political skills and leadership personality alone are not enough while the Prime Minister is more than an institutionally firmed actor.

It is better to consider Tony Blair as a Prime Minister in a more logical and calculated way. Borrowing from classical literature on political leadership: a Prime minister wants to marry the institutional and personal capacities at his disposal. Tony Blair a free premiership, so characteristics of his style of leadership will certainly last as will many of institutional reforms.

1.2 The win of the Labour party in 1997 election

"I think most people who dealt with me think I'm pretty straight kind of guy, and I am .Power without principle is barren, but principle without power is futile. This is party of government and I will lead it as party of government." Tony Blair's declaration on becoming Prime Minister, 1997.

Tony Blair's party won a total victory in the 1997 United Kingdom general election[7]. 419 seats went to the labour, while the conservative won just 165; the labour had majority of 197over all other parties. Blair had only fourty three years, he was the youngest Prime Minister since 1812. For his first term in government, Blair had promised that there would be no increase in income tax and no increase in the general level of public spending. Blair's popularity in the country was very high. The promise not to increase public spending led to disturbance among those labour party supporters who had wanted a rapid increase in speculation in health and education. This popularity and that of the labour party remained

quite high throughout the first term of government, (Mougel, 17). This led Thatcher to say " I'm worried about that young man, he's getting awfully bossy."(Sked, Cook, 135).

In his first term mostly addressed issues which required no increase in public spending, such as transferred government in Scotland and Wales and the freedom information act and for the first time in the United Kingdom minimum wage was introduced. The government also tried to reform the House of Lords, the second chamber of the United Kingdom parliament which is involved mainly in scrutinising, revising and modifying legislation. Until 1997, members of the House of Lords were generally hereditary "Peers of kingdom."The House of Lords Act of 1998 removed the right of the most Peers to sit in until further reform.

This reform did not produce a completely elected chamber that some have wanted; the House now mainly comprises members selected by the Prime Minister to accept their role to public service in many spheres, and they include religious leaders, scientists and representatives from arts and business communities. Wether it is popular that the second chamber of parliament should be elected remains hot in British politics; some feel that its role should be over party politics, while others feel that an elected second chamber would certainly decline the authority of the first(Barendt,385).

1.3 Blair's strategy

The Blair premiership was based on the establishment of a well built centre from where bordered by a faithful circle of advisers. His leadership was extremely adapted, many of the characteristics of the Blair premiership are clear in other countries especially the raise in the constitutional ability around the leader.

Asquith[8] famously remarked that the office of Prime Minister is what the owner wishes and is capable to create of it. Blair's approach to cabinet was as a return to the 18th century, when advisers would set around the monarch, it is perhaps more modelled on Thatcher, who took strong approach to managing her cabinet by committee but she wanted government by herself with a selected ministers really being a political instrument to stay away from conflict and guarantee strength and unity within a single party setting, and Blair's decision are unofficially authorized there .i.e. Blair brought with him many changes but in order of continuity (Hennessy,522).

Berrigton [9] claimed that "In every generation, the British parliament seems to be dying" (128). For decades academics, political commentators and even parliamentarians themselves regularly complained about the decline of parliament and they longed for a fabricated "Golden Age" and that age with Blair, because he held the executive to account led many of the populist power commissions to notice that the executive in Britain is more powerful in relation to the legislative seats than it has been before. Yet, we know that the Blair government set about modernizing parliament with the purpose of reducing its power comparatively to the executive. We can notice that from the picture painted by most contemporary observers : parliament became a shade more responsive to an increasingly media-orientated world; a more rebellious House of Lords; the Commons emerged, more representative of the population as a whole especially of women, which reflecting their growing focus on constituency work.

New Labour's 1997 programme claimed that the House of Commons was in need of modernisation (Mougel,33). The committee on the modernisation of the commons was established in June 1997 in order to decide which practices and procedures should be

modernized. the exact result of the modernization reforms in Blair's term was to make it easier for the government to pass its legislative programme.

The most important reform was to introduce regular programme for every bill, reducing backbench power to examine legislation. The most positive reform in terms of Blair's strategy was the creation in 1999 of Westminister Hall, a similar debating chamber, Semi-Circular in shape, based on the model of the Australian legislature and proposed to deal with non-legislative business. MPs in Horseshoe convention, planned to support constructive, rather than challenging debate.

Although there were no formal votes, backbenchers were able to question junior ministers for an extended period, especially on matters that directly affected their constituencies.

The rate of modernisation accelerate clearly in Blair's Second Administration (2001-2005) with the Prime Minister proposing himself to more analysis than any previous serving Prime Minister. So the labour government has put a wide-collection programme of reforms of both central and local government and these aims reflect the political Agenda of the Third Way as what Rustin declared "Modernisation is an updated version of the idea of progress, but now framed as more as necessity than as triumphal march"(93)

Parliamentary sovereignty is a constitutional principle acquired before the beginning of democracy. So politics of New Labour reflects a challenge across much of Western Europe, in other words and in Blair's mind, modernisation is a ticket attached to wide range of institutional reforms, including those of government party and the political process itself.

Endnotes :

[1] Arthur Scargill was the left -wing leader of the national union of mine workers.

[2] John Smith was an English explorer and early leader of the **JAMESTOWN COLONY**, the first permanent English settlement in North America who depicted the natural wealth of the New World.

[3] Clause four (IV) drafted by Sidney Webb, Clause Four of the constitution of the Labour Party declared that one of the aims of the party was:

To secure for the workers by hand or by brain the full fruits of their industry and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service.

[4] Sidney Webb(1859-1947) English socialist economist, early member of the Fabian society and co-founder of the London school of economics and political science.

[5] Neil Kinnock British politician who was leader of the labour party from 1983to 1992, he is a son of a miner.

[6] Petter Hennessy the doyen of British prime ministerial study.

[7] The 1997 United Kingdom general election results, May1997, House of Commons, BBC News.

[8] Asquith liberal Prime Minister of Great Britain(1908-1916).

[9] Hugh Brington the doyen of British Political Science of parliamentary

Scholars held in the British Academy of 2007.

CHAPTER TWO :

The Third Way

Introduction

The idea of finding a "third way" in politics has been widely discussed over recent time, not only in the United Kingdom, but in the United States, Continental Europe and Latin America. Anthony Giddens[1] shows that developing a third way is not only a possibility but a necessity in modern politics.

The reason behind the third way[2] is the need to move away from a sterile debate between left and right, between who supports either the state or the free market. In other words, the image of a Third Way was used to mark the absence of Labour's leaving from the politics of the social democratic state, suggesting a reconfiguration of relationships between economy and state, public and private, government and people. So this chapter will be about the modernisation of social democracy and the construction of the Third Way and how they are putting the "New" into "New Labour" in order to modernize governance.

1-Modernising Social democracy

As I mentioned in the first chapter, Tony Blair led the British Labour Party to general election victories. Victory represented a successful conclusion to a long development of changing the ideas, policies, organization, and image of the party, the change from Old to New Labour. However, the victory also represented the beginning of a process of applying the ideas behind New Labour to the public sector, the forging of a Third Way and the making of a New Britain and this is from one hand. From another hand to establish the necessities of change and to propose a particular programme of change which excluded different political possibilities in the 1997 labour administration.

1.1-Constructing the Third Way

The Third Way means the possibility of combining social solidarity with a dynamic economy, and this is a goal contemporary social democrats should strive for. To pursue it, Blair claimed that "we will need fewer national governments, less central government, but greater governance over local processes" (Giddens, 5).

The Third Way is commonly linked to the United States Democratic Party in the Bill Clinton[3] era not least as a result of the dialogue on Third Way politics held in Washington in April 1999. But it can also be located in political debates in Europe about the future of social democratic parties. The political context of the United Kingdom is the dominance of class politics, the rise of Thatcherism, the conflict between the state and trades unions in the 1980s, and the long failure of Labour to gain electoral success shaped Labour's attempt to build a new political decision. Here, the Third Way can be viewed as an attempt to shape out an area which dissociats "new" from "old" Labour while rejecting the worst excesses of the neo-

liberal politics of the "new right". The Third Way characterized by the rejection of the past more than the expansion of the future and the idea of a Third Way exaggerates the newness of new Labour while downplaying continuities with both the "old left" and with Conservative policy in the 1980s and 1990s.(Berge, 525).

The Origins of a Third Way as a defeat of old ideologies and marking out a new political land were used widely by Blair to distinguish new Labour from the positions it was displacing. Labour's approach was defined against narratives of past failure in both political speeches and in early discussion documents and policy proposals: "***Our task today is not to fight old battles but to show that there is a Third Way, a way of marrying together an open, competitive and successful economy with a just, decent and humane society***" (Blair's speech to a meeting of the European Socialists conference in Malmo, Sweden, June 1997).

So the Third Way represents progress beyond these old politics but also put for moderateness, in contrast with the radicalism of the other two positions. Their radicalism is listed by the way that they ignored the broad majority who just wanted a normal and healthy life for themselves and their families. Modernisation and moderation went hand in hand in Labour's vision of reform, symbolizing a non-ideological, realistic approach to the use of markets and an importance on the language of partnerships and new contractual forms, i.e. The Third Way thus acted as a surrounding device through which the variable field of welfare policy was ordered and organised in the search of a main position for the new Labour programme. Blair set out a number of oppositions that the Third Way sought to reconcile: "My vision for the twenty-first century is of a popular politics reconciling themes which in the past have wrongly been regarded as antagonistic, patriotism and internationalism; rights and responsibilities; the promotion of enterprise and the attack on poverty and discrimination" (77).

If the Third Way lies between old and new, it is merely a new name for democratic socialism strange to the British. If, on the other hand, the Third Way includes finding a middle way between social democracy and neo-liberalism, so there is no longer a role for such a politics of "in-betweenism" (Jospin[4], 4-5).

In short, we can say that the Third Way can be obesrved not as a logical political programme but as a changeable strategy that aimed to build new coalitions and establish a compromise around new Labour as a political party and government.

1.2-Modernisation: putting the "new" into new Labour

The Third Way tried to build a new political vision by representing selectively on remains and components of the old, and reconfiguring these through the concepts of a modernised economy, a modern public service and a modern people. Modernisation did not of course begin with the Labour administration in the United Kingdom, previous series of reform, going back to the introduction of common suffrage or to the Northcote-Trevalyn reforms of the civil service, can be seen as attempts to modernise the British state and its institutions. Modernisation, also, is a free term applied generally to different programmes of reform or reorganization. Yet, the term gained an appearance within the Labour Party in resistance and in government that went far outside any specific programme of reform (Delors, 63).

Modernisation took a shad and tone as it was used to select ways in which the institutions of party, government and public services must change. As a political process, begun under the leadership of Neil Kinnock and subsequently John Smith, the modernisation of the Labour Party allows it to get electoral success in 1997 as new Labour under the leadership of Tony Blair. Labour's ideological change of modernisation suggests a number of

policies. First, it indirectly creates the need for change, i.e. getting free of the traditional or conservative ideas and practices of the past in the context of globalisation. Secondly, the need for modernisation is situated in the rise of the cynical citizen consumer. Thirdly, it places new Labour as moving, ahead of what are claimed to be the ideological politics of the past. So this idea moves through the discussion of the Third Way and the pragmatic and free approach to social and public policy which has characterised Labour in office. It is related to a programme of reforms for public policy and public services that is based on balanced and scientific practices. Modernisation is situated in a number of structural forces globalization and competition, also the modernization process in the UK is more "globalised" than that of other European nations, is less prepared to take on the role of an active state, and is less prepared to control capitalist economic processes (Jospin, 56).

Supported politics of pragmatism is the main principle of the Labour's modern programme. This large apply of the idea of modernization can be marked especially during the postwar years and with the ideological politics of Thatcherism. The idea of pragmatism was openly used by Labour in its move toward the choice between state and market base on freedom of public services. In the better quality services programme in central government, significance of pragmatism can be found in creating a selection between locate services and private sectors, which transforms conservative policies on market testing and the move from(CCT) the compulsory competitive tendering to Best Value in local government. In other words and according to Thatcher and Major administration this pragmatism was set deside their ideological linking for market solution and also the ideological linking for keeping services inside the public sectors in the "old" labour. So the previous regimes of Thatcher and Major have many points of continuity in the labour governments approach to public service reform, and Labour's project is one of the consequences that appears to hit politics and ideology, therefore The importance was on a balanced goal led a form of politics and an

administrative style of government so, New Labour shares with new managering the obsession of achieving outcomes at the micro level, on the principle of ``what matters is what works'', where ``delivery, delivery, delivery'' is the name of the game' (Newman,56-58). "It is possibly, boring that a government in office should be concerned with delivery and should attempt to move from theory to pragmatism, but Labour appeared to depict different and sometimes contradictory elements of managering. One cord was the scientific balance of goals and results, intentions and capacity, the tension between these reflected deeper tensions in Labour's political approach to carrying its programme" (Crewe, 18).

1.3-Modernising governance

From the programmes of public sector reform about principles that closely linked to the politics of the Third Way is modernisation. It comes as an answer against state condition during large state bureaucracies which was very clear, and **as a** result the protection of mixed economy of service provision has a great importance but in contrast with the importance and value of the third sector in the mixed economy of condition has a stronger tension. Newman said that "There was a softening of the inflexibility of buyer and provider splits and a new emphasis on the language of association and partnership both within and between sectors. There was also a continued focus on consuming and choice, however with a move away from a dependence on market method alone as the sponsor of choice. Such moves suggest an increasing importance of a system in relation to markets in patterns of governance" (52).

Because of the harm which happened to the public services during the conservative government of the 1980s and 1990s, Labour attempted to creat a total reserve to itself. even with the aim of continuity in the basic of production and competence, the modernisation's debate proposes some careful moves that have relation to the New Public Management of the Thatcher government. So Modernisation was given to be not only for short period of

competence but about a long period of success. From the main characteristics of The 1980s and early 1990s were the great focus on institutional reform like (introducing aggressive tender, quasi-markets and purchaser/provider splits).Newman also claimed that "Modernisation was strongly oriented towards the delivery of new policy programme in health, education and social welfare, areas in which the delivery of policy ending was critical to Labour's continued political success"(54). While the fact that the political principles of the Thatcher and Major administrations based on the profit of opposition, so here we can say that modernization came to give more focus on union on the both stages of policy and management, which led to the birth of a new focus on prosperity on that major levels; in the policy process, with a creation of policy reviews, task forces and advisory groups that locate up during the early periods of the new government in order to occupy stakeholders in policy creation. In addition to that there was also an other emphasis on occupying citizens and communities as a members of making decision at a limited stage, and on guarantee the transparency and analysis of the events of free bodies. Another point also that The administration propose was the move in the association between policy-makers (ministers, the senior ranks of the civil service and parliament) and the organisations responsible for the freedom of policy, in all levels: in the public, private or controlled sectors(Newman,233).

"Particular changes came to be legitimated in and through descriptions that placed them in globalised contexts. The elementary structure of such descriptions is familiar: the World has changed. . . . Britain has changed. . . . Consumers have changed. . . . We must change. . . . ." (Clarke, Newman 253).

So, this description let the Labour appropriated in its legitimation of exacting political/policy reforms which results to process where the debate became better with

additional signs like new, modern and that in order of making `modernisation designed to bring more strength and promising that to create a new model of new century.

even with the importance that given to make a change, modernisation was always aims for continuity. Consequently a large number of Labour's electoral policy under the Blair leadership and as I said before, had been worked a lot on the analysis of the Thatcher's government and try to set out of an idea of the future that worked on a re-articulation of the language of community and nationality, reciprocity and duty, honesty and equality. in the same time , the "Third Way" can partially be considred as an effort in order of making the economics of the Thatcher years increased and also moral and civil values try to be fixed rather uneasily with neo-liberal economics. So in public services, the reducing of the purchaser/provider opening in health with the beginning of Best Value in local government, a transfer of approach to the role of competition and market mechanisms were suggested. Changes were also clear in the focusing on "cross-cutting" programme such as crime prevention or social prohibiting, and organisations were encouraged to be to gather in order of delivering which led to the result of creating key social programme. But, modernisation can be also considred as an extension or continuation of the New Public Management, which create a hot debate about to what extent modernisation created a unique political programme and to what extent these reforms are different from the others. So we can defined the idea by its opposition to an assumed past, especially that linked with the old Labour Party(Newman,54).

Bewes claimed that "For Blair, "modernisation" means integration, approachability and informality, the dissolution of barriers and the forging of `connexity'. . . . Politics itself, as the representation of competing interests, is redundant. The political new modality is collaboration rather than antagonism, moderation rather than radicalism, and ideological

exibility rather than entrenched positions. . . . To be a modernizer means nothing more than to be a subscriber to a particular intra- (and increasingly, inter-) party politics" (194).

From one of new Labour's major ideological achievements was the re-birth of modernization that comes from the previous making of reform and led to the establishment of labour as a part of modernization politically, socially and economically.

After the coming of Tony Blair to power with a wave of optimism and the slogan "New Labour, New Britain" as desire to reform both the party and the country, in this chapter, we can say that new Labour, like new Democrats in united states, saw the government as society's servant, not its master. In short, the Labour party has been able to follow a more traditionally social democratic agenda.

End Notes

[1] Anthony Giddens born 18 January 1938 is a British sociologist who is renowned for his theory of structuration and his holistic view of modern societies.

[2] The Third Way philosophy seeks to adapt enduring progressive values to the new challenges of the Information Age. It rests on three cornerstones: the idea that government should promote equal opportunity for all while granting special privilege for none; an ethic of mutual responsibility that equally rejects the politics of entitlement and the politics of social abandonment; and a new approach to governing that empowers citizens to act for themselves.

[3] Bill Clinton was born in August 19, 1946, Hope, Arkansas, U.S. he is 42nd president of the United States (1993–2001), who oversaw the country's longest peacetime economic expansion. In 1998 he became only the second U.S. president to be impeached; he was acquitted by the Senate in 1999.

[4] Lionel Jospin was born in July 12, 1937, Meudon, France. He is a Socialist Party politician who served as prime minister of France (1997–2002) in a cohabitation government with conservative President Jacques Chirac.

[5] (CCT) Compulsory Competitive Tendering.

CHapter three:

Modernising the Governement

Introduction

One of the principal reforms introduced by the Blair governments was the devolution of power from Westminster to elected institutions representing the United Kigdom's territorial nations and regions: a Parliament for Scotland, an assembly for Wales, and an assembly for Northern Ireland. At the same time in England, the Blair governments established regional development agencies in all nine regions. In London this was accompanied by an elected (GLA) [1]the Greater London Authority, although away a simply administrative regionalism developed. This last chapter seeks to evaluate the implication of this major series of modernisation to the Blair legacy. Section one gives a historical context to reform. Section two regards the methods adopted in introducing devolution reform over the period 1997–2007 and in section three discussing the implications of devolution reform from a United Kindom to a federal kingdom of protective politics, judged from opposing academic views.

1-The politics of reform

1.1-The politics of devolution

At first, the main principle when the United Kingdom came together was the preservation of unions between England with Wales in1536, Scotland in 1707 and Ireland in 1800, changed to Northern Ireland in 1921. Constitutionally, the United Kingdom governmental system relaxed on the sovereignty of the United Kingdom parliament, and British wide parties make central to the expansion of a generally unitary political structure. Even the associations between Westminster and the nations and regions always based on defensive division. In Scotland this was reproduced in the circumstances of the Act of Union, and that can be noticed from the late 19th century in the Scottish Office as a defensive office of central government. So the idea of the protective office of state was pretend in Wales in 1964. The politics of Northern Ireland were most unique of all, undeveloped on a division between unionism and nationalism and closely related in turn to the break between Protestant and Catholic religion. In England, by future the most populous nation in the United Kingdom, national identity became set with that of Britain as a whole (Sked, cook 93).

The politics of protective identity always set at the very least a hidden threat to the stability of the United Kingdom state. Nationalists helped the reunification of Northern Ireland with the relax of Ireland, and independence for Scotland and Wales. In response, the United Kingdom centre sought to block nationalist independence and perfectly wanted the protection of the constitutional institution based on parliamentary sovereignty rather than any hold of protective federalism. The compromise of more political rights associated with national identities focused closely on the policy decision of devolution.

This is an openly constitutional and legislative act which occupies the move to a lower elected body on a geographical basis of roles at present exercised by ministers and Parliament (Bogdanor, 2).

Devolution[2] was seen in the 19th century as a means of helpful of what Prime Minister, William Gladstone[4], famously characterised as local patriotism. Yet, despite its deliberation for Scotland and Wales in the early 20th centuries, and again in the 1970s, devolution was before employed only in Northern Ireland between 1921 and 1972.

In reflecting on the reform decision for England, the term "devolution" should only be well used with position to establishing an English parliament and which was considered as one of the most dramatic changes to the structure of British government brought by the Blair administration that was the creation of two new sub-governments in Scotland and Wales.

The modern era of UK protective politics and by the mid-1990s, yet arguments for devolution were much more powerfully put. First, devolution was argued for on identity grounds: as a response to the UK's relative decline and to recognise the rights of stateless nations. For separatist nationalists devolution was a stepping stone to independence; for reformist unionists it was a means to increase independence inside a reconstructed state. Second, devolution was argued for on democratic grounds: that the experience of the Thatcher and Major governments (1979–97) revealed the extent to which benefits could be over traveled by a central UK government essentially elected on English votes and pursuing an unpopular form of neo-liberal state reform. Third, there was an instrumental case: that devolution would create strategic institutions that could promote protective interests in a single European market, create more co-ordinate regional development policies and represent more diverse interests in a profound order of governance in the European Union (Bradley, 48)

The Major government did look for showing more respect for Scottish and Welsh identity. Similarly, they made more effort to achieve devolution in Northern Ireland. John Major[3] was a co-signatory of the Downing Street Declaration in 1994, which refused both British and Irish claims on Northern Ireland and helped to create the conditions for the peace process later in 1994. Even in England, again in 1994, the Major government introduced the (GORs) [4] the Government Office for the Regions as a means of mixing the field actions of central departments. Yet, the Major strategy still appeared too little to reduce support for devolution in Scotland and Wales; in Northern Ireland the Major government's supposed proximity to Unionism which led to Nationalist/Republican disturbance and the end of the IRA[5] ceasefire; and in the English regions the GORs were seen as instruments of central control. In general, the legacy presented to the Blair government was one of inflamed protective politics in each part of the United Kingdom (Peel, 65).

When Tony Blair became leader in 1994, the Labour Party under his pro-devolution predecessor, John Smith, had already developed promises on devolution. Out of power since 1979, and with party strongholds in both Scotland and Wales, a majority in the Labour Party in each country moved towards moral support for devolution. Participation in the (SCC) [6] Scotish constitutional Conventions after 1989 led to accord on a final report in 1995. In Wales, Ron Davies[7] organized debates purely within the Labour Party that also resulted in proposals by 1995. On Northern Ireland, Blair created a policy concerned with Republican arguments for regular UK disconnection. Only on England was policy still quite missing in promise and form, and it remains unclear whether Tony Blair himself was a moral advocate of devolution. financial records of court life appear to indicate that he was not positive on the matter and consequently devolution should not generally be seen as a basic part of the New Labour project as Blair himself defined it. relatively it should be seen as a policy pushed into the Blair's programme by a mixture of forces. Grant reveals the extent to which the Blair

premiership included significant power for the chancellor, Gordon Brown, and that for him Scottish devolution was fixed. Blair had a more natural support for devolution in Northern Ireland, but he was greatly uncomfortable with the party's clear agreement with republicanism, he wanted to move the party to a more just honest dealer role (301).

The Blair leadership was entered by powerful representatives of protective interests, particularly Brown and Prescott[8] . Blair appeared to have finally accepted devolution in terms of the idea that "power devolved was power hold at Westminster" (watts, 105). Whatever objectives there were for devolution out in the country, for Tony Blair it was finally intended to conform to theories of state stability and the continued authority of the centre.

Consequently, between 1994 and 1997 Blair confirmed his party's support for devolution proposals prepared in the Scottish and Welsh parties, and allowed regional reform proposals for England. At the same time Blair was influenced by concern; he insisted that devolution proposals should be passed only after gaining a mandate in separate referendum votes. Blair defined Northern Ireland policy as one that wanted to make agreement. In each case devolution was intended to give expression to identity politics and improve governance, but it was expected that this would also rebind the secure of the UK. Even in Northern Ireland Blair did not expect Irish reunification in his lifetime. It was hoped that devolution would not raise the English question too strongly and that regional reforms would answer any pressures from that direction (Pearce, 54).

The total victory of 1997 election and following election victories in 2001 and 2005 meant that the Blair government was able to see much of their plans to end. This programme of reform raised a number of issues relating not only to the devolved institutions themselves, but also to the development of inter-governmental relations, approaches to public policy difference, and debates about the extra development of devolution. A number of key workings

of the Blair government's evidence can be known for a fuller explanation of movements in the politics of UK devolution.

1.2-United kingdom or Federal kingdom?

First, all three of the devolution decisions were initiated rapidly in the period 1997–1999. It is significant to note also that devolution was introduced on an unbalanced basis. Under the 1998 Scotland Act[9], the Scottish parliament received primary legislative powers in all areas outside of those specifically reserved for the Westminster parliament, this meant the parliament expanded the power to modify or overturn existing legislation in a wide range of domestic policy areas as well as legislate on new areas that came up and were outside Westminster's kept areas. The parliament was dependent on a mass funding from Westminster but it did have the power to differ the level of income tax from the UK level by plus or minus three pence in the pound, in contrast the National Assembly for Wales expected secondary legislative powers on a recorded basis under specific policy headings. This meant that the meeting had the power to pass constitutional instruments and take executive decisions under primary law still made at Westminster. The meeting was also dependent on a block funding from Westminster, but did not have any financial powers of its own.

Also Devolution in Northern Ireland was different again. Under the terms of the 1998 Belfast Agreement (also known as the Good Friday Agreement) the Northern Ireland meeting received a mix of primary legislative and executive powers and was dependent on a mass funding from Westminster. The institutional structure was very unique in including a North-South Ministerial council, bringing together ministers from the Northern Ireland Assembly and their complement from the Irish government, as well as a British-Irish council, providing

for meetings between representatives of the UK and Irish governments and all of the decentralized institutions. The Belfast Agreement also stipulated that all three institutions had to be prepared, or they all destroyed together (Norman, 73).

Second, the official character and institutional means of the devolved institutions was also developed on a very different basis. In Scotland devolution was to the first minister, as the leader of Her Majesty's government in the Scottish parliament. In Wales devolution in its place was to the assembly as a shared body. In both countries, mixed member relative electoral systems, using simple plurality constituency seats and regional lists, were adopted to make the new institutions more representative and encourage more inter-party support. But, in Scotland the total of list seats was 44 per cent, almost promising opportunities that no party could win a majority in the parliament. Temporarily in Wales, the share of list seats was only 33 per cent, leading to the hope that the Labour Party, with its old control of constituency seats, would still win a majority. In both Scotland and Wales preparations wanted to put some flesh on "new politics"; mainly this focused on encouraging consensual work in committees (Crewe, 134).On the other hand, Northern Ireland these issues were dealt with again in even more unique fashion. All members had to select themselves as unionist, nationalist or neither. Devolution was made to a diarchy of first minister and deputy first minister, containing the candidate of the unionist and nationalist unions, and the executive was then collected on a relative power sharing basis of representatives from the different parties. Voting in the assembly was also defined according to rules that required unionist and nationalist authority. Such planning suggested that devolution was expected to operate a consociational form of democracy as opposed to the majoritarian form in Scotland and Wales. With the added North-South and East-West institutions, this was characterised as consociationalism benefit. Northern Ireland was also unique for adopting the (STV) [10] Single Transferable Vote electoral system, as well as institutional features to more set in power sharing (Williams, 85).

Third, the Blair governments put significant political incomes into successfully introducing the new devolved institutions. In the case of Scotland and Wales this was quite simple. Following successful Agenda in 1997 the first elections were held in 1999 and each four years later. In contrast, in Northern Ireland, despite a "yes" vote in 1998, the achievement of the Belfast Agreement was beset by difficulties begin from pressure between unionist and nationalist parties. These arose from differences in understanding their duties, and unionist demands that the paramilitary republican organisation, the IRA, decommission its weapons and support law and order, so the assembly went through a period of uncertain existence until its most long delay between 2002 and 2006.Here we can say that the Blair government, in show with the Irish government and the Northern Ireland parties, however, secured an advance with the St Andrew Agreement in late 2006(Bulter, George, 78).

Finally, the Blair governments' approach to the new devolved executives, despite having preferences, was largely characterised by a reception of the need to work with whoever was elected. In Northern Ireland, the Blair premiership sought to build up the moderate unionist and nationalist parties the (UUP) [11] Ulster Unionist Party and the Social Democratic and Labour Party, also the Blair governments developed an approach to devolved public policy that was largely permissive, and while pressures for change diverse, the Blair government's approach to the development of devolution was generally characterised by flexibility and a desire to reach accommodation. In Scotland, debates emerged primarily about fiscal powers but they did not develop into a determined campaign (Leruez, 288).So the Blair government's plans for regional reform in England were applied, generally with the minimum of arguments. These included the creation of regional development agencies, regional chambers and in London a new greater London authority with an elected mayor. Referenda

for elected regional government were promised in the North-East, North-West and Yorkshire and Humberside, but they were neglected at last because opinion polls showed low support. In the North-East the referendum was held in November 2004 but resulted in a devastating 78 per cent no vote. The Blair government borded on central interference only selectively, primarily in the start up time of devolution in Scotland and Wales and in moments of possible protective crisis such as in Scotland in 2007(Kavanagh, 168).

Overall, throughout Tony Blair's term of office all of these implied priorities appeared to have been continued. It put the flesh on the bones of the idea of "power devolved was power retained", and suggests that the Blair government hoped that by taking a kind and non-programmatic approach to devolution it would be quite easily adapted to the gradualist lines of the British political tradition.

Devolution in Britain has been presented in terms of the needs to preserve the Union. Westminister Parliament has devolved legislative powers to a subordinate assembly that has the potential over time to acquire a political authority that could rival that of Westminister in matters of Scottish law and government. So the present Scottish parliament has marks of subordinate legislature, but political and national sentiment in Scotland will rate it more highly than this, in addition to that Blair's role in facilitating the political process in Norther Ireland was important in bringing to a final conclusion the worst and most continuing conflict in Western Europe since the Second World War. It appears unlikely that many future's British prime ministers will offer a legacy as distinctive or important.

Endnotes:

[1] (GLA) Greater London Authority.

[2] Devolution, the term devolution refers to devolving political decision-making power from the center to sub-national units. This involves no loss of sovereignty at the center, for power s which are devolved, could in theory at least, be taken back again by Act of parliament at some point in the future.

3 John Major was born in March 29, 1943, London, England, he is British politician and public official who was prime minister of the United Kingdom from 1990 to 1997.

[4] (GORs) the Government Office for the Regions.

[5] IRA: Irish Republican Army.

[6] (SCC) Scottish Constitutional Conventions.

[7] Ron Davies, Shadow secretary of state.

[8] John Prescott was the author of the early 1980's alternative regional strategy, and now deputy leader, he was also in a position to press the case for regional reform in England.

[9] the 1998 Scotland Act is an act of the parliament of the United Kingdom. It is the Act which established the devolved Scottish parliament.

[10] (STV) Single Transferable Vote.

[11] (UUP) Ulster Unionist Party.

Conclusion

At the beginning of my work I asked the question: Did Blair introduce reforms that were of different in extent or nature from the previous reforms? Labour's approach to governance seems to reflectect many of these reforms. The pragmatic politics of the Third Way, described in Chapter 2, were based on an explicit rejection of both largely hierarchical and largely market based on style of coordination. There are significant overlaps between governance theory and the Third Way starts of moving beyond the substitutes of state and market. Labour emphasised the value of partnership as a way of bringing services, straining both the need for association between the public and private sectors and the importance of voluntary and community based on organisations working in partnership with the constitutional sector.

The government also attempted to build the capacity of the public policy system to act in a more automatic and responsive way, also we can say that there was evidence of different stages of government in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, at regional, city and local levels appealing in what is termed "negotiated self-governance".

So, Blair's heritage can thus be seen as considerable, less in ideological terms as in the practical policy decisions of his Labour governments. Most of these policy enactments were accepted by the Conservative Party following temporary symbolic opposition. In ideological terms, the acceptance by Blair of the free market as the generator of wealth is acknowledged by the Conservatives. However, the Conservatives argue that Labour's preference for state control at the expense of private sector delivery of services and the promotion of individual choice has been largely undiminished by Blairism. A combination of party limitation ideological barriers and ineffective policy development prevented Blair from fundamentally reforming the delivery of public goods in the way he desired. Given that Brown's greater

interest was in economic stability than in public service reform, it is difficult to envisage the post-2007 Labour government achieving where Blair partly failed.

Blair's 1997 election victory is generally not considered a divided election in the way in which 1945 and 1979 are regarded. Aspects of good fortune and sound management by Labour, in respect of a generally imposing economic record, are obviously reversible and the party's hard won reputation as a party of economic competence can easily disappear, risks accentuated by global economic problems. Brown's inheritance but also his legacy, for the two cannot be distinguished given his ubiquitous presence under Blair was an economy in poorer shape than in 1997 and an electorally unpromising landscape. The lasting significance of the Blair government, in two areas, matches the importance of the fundamental changes of the welfare state and labour market reform introduced by the Attlee and Thatcher victories respectively. Firstly, the apparently permanent restructuring of the UK via devolution, a process whose endpoint may yet be the fracturing of that Kingdom, was a change which places the significance of the Blair government in constitutional terms way beyond any antecedent government since Britain remove from most of Ireland in 1922. Secondly, Blair's role in facilitating the political process in Northern Ireland was important in bringing to a final conclusion the worst and most enduring conflict in western Europe since the Second World War. It appears unlikely that many future British prime ministers will offer a legacy as distinctive or important.

Bibliograghy

Books:

1. Barendt, Eric. <u>An Introduction to Constitutional Law. </u>Clarendon Law Series. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

2. Berge, Albert<u>. Postmodernisation and Radicalism of Indifference. </u>Cambridge Polity Press: 1997.

3. Berrigton, Lewis. <u>British Democracy</u>: <u>Its Restoration and Extension</u>. Industrial System Research: 2006.

4. Bewes, Albert. <u>The Moderniser's Dilemma:</u> <u>Radical Politics in the Age of Blair.</u> London, 1998.

5.Bill Jones, Kavanagh, Dennis. <u>British Politics Today.</u> 7th edition. Contemporary Review Company: 2003.

6. Blair, Tony. <u>New Britain: My Vision of a Young Country. </u>Boulder Westview Press: 1997.

7. Bogdanor, Vernon. <u>Devolution in the United Kingdom.</u> Oxford University Press: 2001.

8. Bradley, Smith. <u>Globalisation and welfare states.</u> London, Macmillan: 2000.

9. Brutley, Richard. <u>A New Vision for Local Government. </u>London, Institute for Public Policy and Research, 1998

10. Bulter, George. <u>Twentieth Century British Political facts 1900-2000</u>. MacMillan Press Ltd, Basing Stoke, 2000.

11. Clarke, john, Newman, Michael. <u>The tyranny of transformation.</u> London,Weidenfeld and Nicolson. Second edition: 1968.

12. Clegg, David. <u>Modern Organisations</u> : <u>Organisation Studies in the PostmodernWorld</u>. London, Sage.1990.

13. Delors, Jacques. <u>La troisième voie</u> : <u>Le renouveau de la social-democratie</u>. Seuil , Paris, 2001.

14. Giddens, Anthony. <u>The Third Way and its Critics</u>. Cambridge, Polity Press :2000.

15. Hennessy, Petter. <u>The parliamentary State.</u> London etc: 1993.

16. Jospin, lionel. <u>Modern Socialism :</u> <u>The Fabian Society</u>. London: 1998.

17. Kavanagh, Denies. <u>British politics</u> : <u>Continuities & Change.</u> Oxford university Press: 1998.

18. Leruez, Jacques. <u>Le système politique britanique</u> : <u>De Winston Churchill à Tony Blair.</u> Armand Colin, Paris : 2001.

19. Mougel, Fancois-Charles. <u>Royaume-Uni</u> : <u>Les années blair.</u> La Documentation Française, Paris : 2005.

20. Newman, James. <u>The Reform of Parliament</u>. Manchester University Press: 2001.

21. Newman, Janet. <u>Modernising governance:</u> <u>New Labour, policy and society.</u> Sage publications: London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi:2001

22. Pearce, Stephen. <u>Blair's Britain</u>. John Wiley and Sons: 2002.

23. Peele, Gillian. <u>Governing the UK</u>: <u>British Politics in the 21st Century.</u> 4th edition. Blackwell Publishers: 2004.

24. Rustin, Moyer. <u>Key Ideas in Politics</u>. First edition. Nelson Thornes Publications : 2003.

25. Sked, Alan, Cook, Chris. <u>Post-War Britain</u> : <u>A Political History</u>. Penguin Group: 1984.

26. Watts, Duncan. <u>British Government and Politics</u>: <u>A Comparative Guide</u>. Edinburgh University Press: 2006.

27. Williams, Andy. <u>UK Government and Politics.</u> Second edition. Heinemann: 1998.

Online Newspapers

1-Norman, Mathew. 'A written constitution is the answer.' The Independent Newspaper. Thursday, 4December2008.

http://www. Independent .co.uk/opinion/commentators/Mathew-norman/Mathew-norman-a-written-constitution-is-the-answer-1050613.html

2-Watt, Nicholas. 'Monarchy must lose powers in order to survive.' The Guardian Newspaper. Monday8April2002 02.23 BST.

http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2002/apr/08/queenmother. monarchy.