

A close-up portrait of Tony Blair, looking directly at the camera with a neutral expression. He has short, graying hair and is wearing a dark suit jacket over a light-colored, button-down shirt. The background is a solid, light blue color.

**THE NO. 1
BESTSELLER**
With a new
introduction

TONY BLAIR

A JOURNEY

Contents

About the Book
Praise for *A Journey*
Dedication
Acknowledgements
Picture Acknowledgements
Introduction to the Paperback Edition
Introduction

1. High Expectations
2. The Apprentice Leader
3. New Labour
4. Honeymoon
5. Princess Diana
6. Peace in Northern Ireland
7. 'We Govern in Prose'
8. Kosovo
9. Forces of Conservatism
10. Managing Crises
11. A Mandate for New Labour
12. 9/11: 'Shoulder to Shoulder'
13. Iraq: Countdown to War
14. Resolution
15. Iraq: the Aftermath
16. Domestic Reform
17. 2005: TB/GB
18. Triumph and Tragedy
19. Toughing It Out
20. Endgame
21. Departure

22. Postscript

Picture Section

Index

Copyright

ABOUT THE BOOK

TONY BLAIR is the politician who defines our times. His emergence as Labour leader in 1994 marked a seismic shift in British politics. Within a few short years, he had transformed his party and rallied the country behind him, becoming prime minister in 1997 with the biggest victory in Labour's history, and bringing to an end eighteen years of Conservative government. He took Labour to a historic three terms in office, as the dominant political figure of the last two decades.

A JOURNEY is Tony Blair's first-hand account of his years in office and beyond. Here he describes for the first time his role in shaping our recent history, from the aftermath of Princess Diana's death to the war on terror. He reveals the leadership decisions that were necessary to reinvent his party, the relationships with colleagues such as Gordon Brown and Peter Mandelson, the gruelling negotiations for peace in Northern Ireland, the battles over education and health, the implementation of the biggest reforms to public services since 1945, and his relationships with leaders on the world stage, from Mandela and Clinton to Putin and

Bush. He analyses the belief in ethical intervention that led to his decisions to go to war, in Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Afghanistan and, most controversially of all, in Iraq.

A *JOURNEY* is a book about the nature and uses of political power. In frank, unflinching, often wry detail, Tony Blair charts the ups and downs of his career to provide insight into the man, as well as the politician and statesman. He explores the challenges of leadership, and explains why he took on public opinion to stand up for what he believed in. He also looks forwards, to emerging power relationships and economies, and to Britain's changing role, addressing the vital issues and complexities of our global world.

Few British prime ministers have shaped the nation's course as profoundly as Tony Blair, and his achievements and his legacy will be debated for years to come. Amid the millions of words written about him, this book is unique: his own journey, in his own words.

PRAISE FOR *A JOURNEY*

‘Prime ministerial memoirs are traditionally stuffy, formal and guarded, as though written under police caution. Tony Blair’s are nothing of the sort.’ Craig Brown, *Mail on Sunday*

‘Tony Blair’s memoir is part psychodrama, part treatise on the frustrations of leadership in a modern democracy ... Blair comes across as likeable, if manipulative; capable of dissembling while wonderfully fluent; in short, a brilliant modern politician.’ Lionel Barber, *Financial Times*

‘That Blair was a formidable politician can be seen in the glimpses we get of how his mind works ... You are left thinking two things: that it would be a blessing if some of today’s politicians took note ... and that, whatever your view of Blair, you still wouldn’t want to take him on in an election.’ *The New Yorker*

‘He has done politicians a huge favour by reinventing the art of the memoir in a way not achieved since Alan Clark’s Diaries. Funny and self-deprecating.’ Jeremy Hunt, *Observer*, Books of the Year

‘This is a substantial, thoughtful book ... he has for the most part set down honestly his version of events and

attempted seriously to engage with his critics.’ Chris Mullin, *The Times*

‘What makes his memoir so absorbing as it swings from clever phrase-making and thoughtful contemporary history to wince-inducing self-analysis, is that he is the first of a generation of politicians to conduct their craft as if observing themselves from an amused and admiring distance – and then to write about it. No recent politician has examined his own motives and psychology quite so candidly.’ John Rentoul, *Independent*

‘It is the small revelations about the character of Blair that make this book worthwhile.’ Ross Clark, *Express*

‘This is a more honest political memoir than most and more open in many respects than I had anticipated. He is compellingly candid about how scared he was when he first became prime minister ... He is unusually direct about his calculations, even when they don’t reflect well on him ... He admits to stretching the truth beyond “breaking point” to secure a settlement in Northern Ireland. Even when the lies are told in a noble cause, few politicians are honest enough to admit that they sometimes feel compelled to be deceivers.’ Andrew Rawnsley, *Observer*

‘Engrossing ... Informal and candid enough to keep the reader thoroughly engaged.’ Fareed Zakaria, *The New York Times Book Review*

‘It’s a gripping insight into the ex-PM’s ten years of power ... It will take a lot for many people to read his own take on the rise and fall of New Labour, but those

that do might be reminded of the charm and vision
that swept him to power.' *News of the World*

'For fair-minded readers, this book will be a fantastic
surprise ... funny, ruthless and unputdownable ... Blair
clearly relishes the opportunity to tell it as he saw it.

After years of minding his PMQs, our former leader
gives it to us with both barrels.' Allison Pearson, *Daily
Telegraph*

'Deeply personal ... Full of candid revelations ... A
priceless glimpse into the mind of the man who ...
stood by America in some of its darkest recent hours.'

Wall Street Journal

'Unique ... A political biography of unusual interest.'

Los Angeles Times

'This is a good read and shows us what can be done
when we have confidence, clarity and a clear sense of
purpose: we can win and change the country for the
better.' Alistair Darling, *Guardian*

'Such was the outburst of instant and largely hostile
reaction when this book hit the newsstands that
almost everyone failed to notice that it is very good ...
it is a very good book because it tells the reader more
clearly than any other prime ministerial memoir I
know why the author thinks what he thinks and did
what he did.' Charles Moore, *Daily Telegraph*

'A political biography of unusual interest ... Blair is
one of the great politicians of this generation and that
makes his candid moments particularly interesting.'

The Philadelphia Inquirer

‘Fluently written ... Engaging.’ Michiko Kakutani, *The New York Times*

‘[An] immensely readable political memoir.’ *The Irish Times*

‘One of the most readable and engaging political autobiographies I’ve ever come across. I read it twice – fast and furious on the day after publication, like most of the hacks – then at leisure, when my reaction was totally different. It is only when you read this book as an ordinary person would read it, rather than as a cynical journalist after copy, that you appreciate how original and compelling it is ... [it is] very funny, often startling, always colloquial and direct. It is packed with information, vivid images and telling anecdotes ... Blair takes you to the centre of the action, to the sweat-stained hyperactive heart of government, where life and death decisions are taken by the day.’ *The Herald*

‘Well-written and perhaps unintentionally self-revealing ... Blair reveals himself through his thrusting political ambition, his rationales for decisions, his preoccupation with public image and his determination to play a prominent role on the world stage.’ *The Washington Post Book World*

‘Blair’s autobiography makes unusually compelling reading for a political memoir.’ *Financial Times*, Books of the Year

‘The big daddy was Tony Blair’s *A Journey*.’ Quentin Letts, *Daily Mail*, Books of the Year

‘Tony Blair ... remains a consummate communicator. *A Journey* was written with a colloquial ease – light

years from the starchiness of previous prime ministerial memoirs.' *Sunday Telegraph*, Books of the Year

'Intellectually and emotionally engaging ... Blair writes well, practises transparency, and on almost every page explains his decisions in detail.' *Christian Science Monitor*

To Cherie, Euan, Nicholas, Kathryn and Leo and my wider family who have shared the journey with me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When it was first suggested that I write this book, Bob Barnett, lawyer, friend and negotiator extraordinaire, expertly steered the negotiations that brought me to Random House. It has been a happy partnership ever since. I would like in particular to thank Gail Rebeck, a long-time friend and also, I can now add with pride, my publisher. Gail's passion for this project, and her faith that she would one day receive a completed manuscript, despite indications to the contrary, never wavered.

I would like to pay tribute to the calm professionalism of her team at Random House. My foremost editorial thanks go to Caroline Gascoigne and David Milner, who have lived with this book almost as long as I have and who have been wonderful throughout. Thanks are also due to Susan Sandon, Charlotte Bush and Claire Round; John Swannell for the photo-shoot that produced the front cover; Richard Ogle for the cover design; Fiona Greenway for the picture research; and the rest of the dedicated production team.

In the USA, Sonny Mehta and Jonathan Segal of Knopf have been enthusiasts for this project from the start - I

have found their guidance and advice to be invaluable.

Among my own team it would have been impossible without Catherine Rimmer and Victoria Gould standing over me as I wrote out each word on hundreds of notepads; refusing all phone calls, meetings and other welcome distractions from the creative process. As the publisher's deadline approached, they even took my BlackBerry away from me. My researcher, Anthony Measures, provided facts and research material and tirelessly trawled through thousands of documents. I am grateful to my band of armchair book critics for their insights and editorial advice: Andrew Adonis, David Bradshaw, Alastair Campbell, Matthew Doyle, Peter Hyman, Philip Gould and Jonathan Powell.

There are countless people from my life in politics without whom this journey would never have begun: my agent in Sedgefield John Burton; his wife Lily and the members of the Sedgefield Labour Party, who put their faith in me right back at the beginning and whose loyalty has been steadfast ever since. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to my staff in the early years as Leader of the Opposition and then those in Downing Street; you could never wish for a more loyal and professional group of people - many of whom are mentioned in the book. Of course this book is dedicated to my family. So that tells its own story.

Finally, I would like to thank the people who now work for me in the new chapter of my journey since leaving Downing Street. I am constantly impressed by the enthusiasm and commitment they bring to helping solve some of the issues in the world today, on which I try to work: a greater understanding between the religious faiths; peace in the Middle East; solutions to climate change; and governance in Africa. They know who they are and they should be immensely proud of the work they do.

PICTURE ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

i-iv: Author's private collection; Author's private collection; Author's private collection; Francis Mathes/Author's private collection

v-viii: Courtesy of Alan Collenette; Courtesy of Alan Collenette; Courtesy of Alan Collenette; Author's private collection; Mirrorpix; Photograph by Jacob Sutton, Camera Press London

ix-xii: Author's private collection; Ian McIlgorm/Press Association Images; Author's private collection; Neville Marriner/*Daily Mail*/Rex Features

xiii-xvi: Gemma Levine/Hulton Archive/Getty Images; Westminster Press/Author's private collection; Tom Kidd/Rex Features; Author's private collection

xvii-xx: Reuters/Kieran Doherty; Author's private collection; PA Photos/Topfoto; Kevin Holt/*Daily Mail*/Rex Features

xxi-xxiv: Neil Munns/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Tom Stoddart/Getty Images; Tom Stoddart/Getty Images; Tom Stoddart/Getty Images

xxv-xxviii: Author's private collection; Clive Limpkin/*Daily Mail*/Rex Features; Tim Rooke/Charles Ommanney/Rex

Features; Rebecca Naden/PA Archive/Press Association Images

xxix-xxxii: Author's private collection; © Martin Argles/eyevine; PA Photos/Topfoto; Rooke/Jorgensen/Rex Features

xxxiii-xxxiv: © Annie Liebowitz/Contact Press Images/nbpictures; Owen Humphreys/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Tom Stoddart/Getty Images; David Giles/PA Archive/Press Association Images; © Chris Laurens; © Fred Jarvis

xxxv-xxxviii: Rex Features; Tom Stoddart/Getty Images; Courtesy of the William J. Clinton Presidential Library; Courtesy of the William J. Clinton Presidential Library; Courtesy of the William J. Clinton Presidential Library

xxxix-xli: Courtesy of the William J. Clinton Presidential Library; Sipa Press/Rex Features; Reuters/Blake Sell

xlii-xlv: Author's private collection; Reuters/Paul Bates; Rex Features; Rex Features

xlvi-xlviii: PA/PA Archive/Press Association Images; PA Archive/Press Association Images; PA/PA Archive/Press Association Images; PA Archive/Press Association Images; PA Wire/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Rex Features

xlix: Martin McCullough/Rex Features; James Gray/NI Syndication; PA Photos/Topfoto; Sipa Press/Rex Features; Cathal McNaughton/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Martin McCullough/Rex Features

l-lii: Reuters/Crispin Rodwell; Martin McCullough/Rex Features; Author's private collection; Author's private collection

liii-lvii: Rex Features; Reuters/Pawel Kopczynski; John Stillwell/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Rex Features; Richard Young/Rex Features

lviii-lxii: Author's private collection; Photograph by Mary McCartney, Camera Press London; Author's private collection; Author's private collection; Author's private collection

lxiii-lxvi: Peter Macdiarmid/Rex Features; Reuters/Dylan Martinez; Mike Forster/*Daily Mail*/Rex Features; Stefan Rousseau/PA Archive/Press Association Images

lxvii-lxxi: Adrian Dennis/AFP/Getty Images; Adrian Dennis/AFP/Getty Images; Reuters/Pool old; Author's private collection; Anthony Measures; Toby Melville/PA Archive/Press Association Images

lxxii-lxxiv: Ron Sachs/Rex Features; Photograph by Moreen Ishikawa, courtesy of the George W. Bush Presidential Library; Photograph by Moreen Ishikawa, courtesy of the George W. Bush Presidential Library

lxxv-lxxvii: Spencer Platt/Getty Images; Chris Ison/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Johnny Green/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Andrea Mohin/NYT/Redux/eyevine; Paul J Richards/AFP/Getty Images

lxxviii-lxxx: Reuters/Erik de Castro; Reuters/ Pool/Stefan Rousseau JV; Jeff Christensen/Pool/Getty Images; Stefan Rousseau/PA Archive/Press Association Images

lxxxii-lxxxv: © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; PA/PA Archive/Press Association Images

lxxxvi-xc: © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; Sipa Press/Rex Features

xci-xciv: © Simon Walker/NI Syndication; Dan Chung/Guardian News & Media Ltd; Ian Waldie/Getty Images; Jerome Delay/AP/Press Association Images

xcv-c: Ian Waldie/Getty Images; Ian Waldie/Getty Images; Chris Ison/PA Archive/Press Association Images; *The Times*/Peter Nicholls/NI Syndication; © Nick Danziger/nbpictures; Rota/Anwar Hussein Collection/Getty Images

ci-cvi: Ilan Mizrahi/Redux/eyevine; EG/*Israel Sun*/Rex Features; Camera Press/Alastair Grant/Rota; Sipa Press/Rex Features; PA/PA Archive/Press Association Images; Tom Hanson/AP/Press Association Images
cvii-cxi: Dan Chung/Guardian News & Media/eyevine; John Gichigi/Getty Images; Adrian Dennis/AFP/Getty Images; Dylan Martinez/AP/Press Association Images; Kevin Coombs/PA Archive/Press Association Images
cxii-cxv: Reuters/Mike Finn Kelcey; Paul Faith/AFP/Getty Images; Reuters/Nigel Roddis; Stefan Rousseau/PA Archive/Press Association Images
cxvi-cxix: Jeff J Mitchell/Getty Images; Dan Chung/Guardian News & Media Ltd; Photograph by Zoe Norfolk, Camera Press London; © Felix Clay/eyevine
cxx-cxxii: Daniel Berehulak/Getty Images; Reuters/Jim Young; Thaer Ganaim/PPO via Getty Images
cxxiii-cxxvi: Matthew Doyle; Reuters/Nayef Hashlamoun; Benny Thomas/GEMS Education; © North News and Pictures Ltd

INTRODUCTION TO THE PAPERBACK EDITION

It's almost a year since the hardback edition of this book was published. So much has happened, not least in the region where I spend so much time - the Middle East. Following the financial crisis, there have also been developments in Europe and the US that merit comment.

This introduction plainly connects to the last chapter of the book, but here I develop an argument only touched on there: the traditional left/right divide of Western politics still dominates much of our political discourse, yet it is an essentially twentieth-century construct that is now not only increasingly redundant, it is an obstruction to new ideas and sound policy.

This is not to say that ideals or values no longer matter - they matter hugely, and the progressive/conservative divide (a more modern version of left/right) still has relevance. What is more, that divide offers a big opportunity for progressive politics since the spirit of the times is meritocratic and modernising. Yet such labels have to be treated with caution. I remain unequivocally on the progressive side of politics, but I am fiscally more conservative, and on markets, liberal. Many conservatives are today socially liberal, in favour of gay rights and passionate advocates of women's equality. A foreign policy

of liberal interventionism has its detractors and supporters in both camps.

When it comes to policy, the challenge today is efficacy, not ideology. People want government that works, that is above all effective in making change. To achieve this, governments have to liberate themselves from ideology based on left/right and embrace new ways of thinking that cross the traditional party lines. In pursuit of this objective, I argue that a more relevant political divide for the twenty-first century is 'open vs closed'. It defines attitudes to globalisation; to culture and identity; and to change. The open-minded see globalisation as an opportunity; the closed-minded as a threat, a process driven by greed and big business, in which we are helpless pawns. The open-minded are accepting of those of different faiths and cultures; the closed-minded regard them as alien and corrupting. Above all, the open-minded embrace new ideas and change, seeing the potential for advancement; the closed-minded tend to defend the status quo. This divide zigzags across traditional politics. You find those who call themselves progressives and conservatives on both sides of the debates about immigration, free trade and energy, for example.

The twenty-first century will belong to those who by instinct and education are open to the world as it changes, and are prepared to modernise and think anew. This open-minded attitude is not just about the way we view the world; it is intrinsic to whether the West regains its sense of self-confidence and self-belief. There is, at present, and for reasons that are completely comprehensible, an acute pessimism in the West. Any young graduate seeking work can tell you how tough it is. For those without qualifications, jobs are often low paid or highly insecure. Add to this alarm over extremism, anger at what appears to be uncontrolled immigration, and the gathering sense that

new powers, notably China, are emerging to take our place, and it is easy to see why this pessimism is so rampant.

It is, however, misguided and unnecessary. We have been through tough times before - actually much tougher - and survived and prospered. It's true new powers are emerging. But ask the immigrants why they prefer our way of life. If these new powers succeed, it will be at least as much by emulation as by difference.

For example, I believe that this century will see Africans seize their destiny in their own hands and triumph over their adversities. The world needs what they have to offer in raw materials, commodities and agriculture. There is a new generation of smart, capable leaders coming to the fore, but whether and how fast they succeed will depend to a significant extent on the degree to which they take the best lessons of governance from us and apply them. They still look to us, and rightly so. And the Middle East? It turns out they do want democracy.

Above all, we are the birthplace of the open-minded. We were the leaders in ideas; and to a large extent we still are. We were the creative ones, the innovators, the radical reformers of the status quo, not just in economics, governance, social progress but in thought, and other disciplines whose ideas define the future. Our problem is not our situation but ourselves. Do we still want to lead the world? Do we still want to be led by leaders capable of harnessing that innate power of creativity?

The world needs our leadership for a very simple reason: while our values may have been nurtured in the West, their appeal and their ownership is vested in humanity. Liberty, justice, the people above the government not the government above the people: these are the values we forged over centuries and they represent the steadfast evolution of human progress.

At present we have this curious jumble of paradoxes and contradictions: the world needs our leadership but we are

fearful of leading; our politics is organised according to distinctions of left vs right that, in their most crude form, the people have long since moved on from; and though the future belongs to the optimistic and open-minded, we are in danger of being defeatist and closed-minded.

What should leaders do? When people ask me about leadership, I can talk about character, temperament and attitude, about 'doing the right thing' and having 'the right stuff', all of which is important. But sometimes I think that the hardest thing is getting the right answer. This is harder still in an era of uniquely low predictability.

The oddest yet most interesting thing about being an ex-leader is how much I did not know when I was a leader, how much there is to learn about the world and how endlessly fascinating are the processes of change going on within it. I've been to the Middle East twelve times in the last few months and over sixty times since leaving office. I travel regularly to China and of course to the US. I have seen for myself that the US is more than New York and Washington, as China is more than Beijing and Shanghai. I've learned about Indonesia and Malaysia, and started to know Mexico, Brazil and Colombia, countries I had barely visited before. I also spend time in Africa.

The relief from the day-to-day pressure of office has given me space to analyse. The memory of what it was really like to lead means that I retain real respect for those who assume the mantle of leadership. I know it is a lot easier to give the advice than to take the decision.

Occasionally I even wonder if I became a leader too young. Of course, nowadays we tend to like our leaders younger. They look better, seem more dynamic, have a positive energy that stimulates in the electorate a positive glow; but in my case judgement and experience have deepened with age. In a curious way, as a younger leader I was better able to articulate the bright, new horizon; but as a more mature leader I was better able to get there.

(Though being now two years off sixty as I write this, I suppose I would say that.)

I now feel a huge pulse of urgency about our situation. This is not simply the onset of age or the musings of a global wanderer - indeed I have never felt more adrenalin or energy - it is that the key to our success today is to analyse, understand, and then be part of the way the world is changing. When times are hard, the inclination is to be introspective. But it is in the nature of these times that in order to advance, we have to be global.

The chief characteristic of today's world is the speed of change, driven by technology. When I was growing up, technological advance was often to do with how we made things. It was about how we travelled - by car or plane - and then about how we got the news. In the 1960s and 1970s, we had very standard ways of getting information. There were major news channels that everyone shared. The choices we could make were limited by the technology, and we depended on government for a range of decisions only they could make.

The Internet has changed that world. We have the power in our own hands to communicate, interact and obtain information. The result is transformative. We don't just work differently, we live and think differently. There is the instantaneous transmission not only of news, but of thoughts, moods, opinions and sentiment.

The world is ever more interdependent. OK, that's a cliché now, but what isn't grasped are the consequences of it. Take the financial crisis - significant for many reasons, but perhaps most importantly as the most dramatic demonstration of what it means to live in a truly interdependent global financial market. Those countries most deeply wired into that global market suffered for it. Those who avoided it - very few - could do so both because their banks were far more tightly controlled but also because they lagged behind the rest of the world in

financial innovation (characteristics which themselves bring a separate raft of problems associated with them). And crisis did not spread simply as a result of rational analysis, by market participants, of failing financial products; rather, market sentiment gathered pace and rolled into tidal waves of panic, shifting perceptions of both the financial system as well as individual nations' economic stability.

This linkage isn't only financial. Political, cultural and social ideas are also communicated in real time and have global reach and power. The uprisings in the Middle East are partly the product of the new social media's ability to pass information within a country; but also the global reaction to events bouncing back into the national political debate, fuelling and shaping it. All of this is accelerating the pace of change. Leaders are taking decisions against a background of uncertainty and change that both constantly alter that background and constrain enormously what any one country on its own can do to manage the consequences.

Added to all this is the rise of China, and India, and others not far behind. The most elusive thing in any discussion of China is to get your head round its size. We know it's big, has 1.3 billion people, and is now a power; but none of that conveys adequately the immensity of its impact on us. If you shut down the whole of the UK - the fifth largest economy in the world - so that it emitted no greenhouse gas emissions whatsoever, the rise in emissions from the Chinese economy would make up the difference in under two years. We debate, rightly, the third runway at Heathrow, on environmental grounds; China will build seventy new international airports in the next decade. By 2030 there will be 300 commercial airports. The USA has nine, maybe ten cities with a population of over a million, while the EU has around twenty; China has over 160. Think how different Finland is from Greece, or even Germany and

Italy, the British and the Spanish. In Western Europe there are great differences of culture, ethnicity and habits. Now think of that multiplied by three. Think of sixty different Chinese ethnic groupings. Think of hundreds of millions of Chinese industrialised in the last twenty years which has produced China's transformation economically and politically. Then think of the same again in the next twenty. You start to get some idea of the scale, complexity and depth of change that China's development is going to bring. Not a single aspect of our lives will be untouched by it. From the environment, to the production of cheap consumer goods we take for granted, to the way the world's commodities are mined and used, China's rise will transform our lives.

India's population is 1.2 billion and rising. Indonesia has three times the number of people as Germany. Brazil and Russia are going to be giants of the world economy. All these nations face serious challenges, of course, but the trend is unmistakable and irreversible: the geopolitics of the twenty-first century will be unlike anything the modern world has seen. Our children in the West will be a generation growing up in a situation where virtually every fixed point of reference that my and my parents' generation knew has changed or is changing. Included in these fixed points of reference is traditional politics - and that is why leadership is so tough.

Of course there are voters who remain absolutely committed to traditional left/right politics - often they make most noise - but there is a swelling crowd of people who don't conform to such politics and who can determine elections. One group are those who focus as much on 'cultural' questions as normal left/right politics. The Tea Party in the US is a reaction to what they perceive as the dominance of a liberal elite. In Europe, you have the far right parties like that of Le Pen in France, or the new parties that have popped up in countries such as Sweden,

Holland and Finland that we used to think of as having very predictable politics. But the other group are a large, somewhat disenfranchised group of centrist voters who just distrust the simplicity of the left/right labels.

Let us try for a moment to disentangle this. At one level, given the debates in the US such as the programme of cuts in Wisconsin, or in the UK about tuition fees for students, you might think it bizarre to claim left/right battles a thing of the past. Surely these are just that: left vs right and very much with us. But that is an illusion. That is to focus on the surface noise. Look deeper and actually what has happened in this past half-century is that the left/right distinctions have become blurred. It would be too simplistic to say the left has won the battle over values and the right has won the battle over policy direction, but it is a little like that.

When I was growing up, social justice was a value of the left. Today, conservatives as well as progressives will lay claim to fairness. The argument is over who has the best policy to achieve it. Both groups say they represent 'regular' people or 'hard-working' families; both identify with enhanced opportunity and social mobility; both are against 'elites'. The patrician Republican or Tory is in short supply and even shorter demand. Where the right are more traditionally 'right' on values - abortion, gay rights, etc. - this tends to be at the base, not amongst voters.

However, on policy, we are in the course of a long steady march to a rebalancing of individual responsibility and choice with the power of the state - on taxes, welfare and public services. At first this was driven by the costs of the state, the widening of the tax base and the sense of the state taking up too much ground. Now there is a fresh driver: a desire to exercise much greater choice and individual preference - the norm in private-sector transactions - in the public sector. And all of it, of course, enhanced by the potential of technology.

What is interesting is how little this march has been arrested by the financial crisis. In 2008, it was commonly believed that the left would gain from a mess thought not just to be 'of the market' but begotten by unrestricted market practices. The state was said to be back in fashion. If it was, the fashion quickly passed. European elections and the US midterms saw, if anything, a move rightwards. Even the conservative leaders in Europe today tend to be under threat from parties more to the right or on non-traditional platforms rather than from the conventional left.

Here is the point of fascination: many people voting this way don't regard themselves as going 'right' on these issues. They don't view it in partisan terms. They view it practically.

This is not to say that because ideology is discredited, politics has become a game of realpolitik, everything traded and bartered and bargained in a never-ending street haggle. There's an enormous appetite for ideas and ideals. Neither does it mean that people don't want big change. They do. They know they need it and they will vote for it. It's just that they won't buy it from someone who they regard as ideologically motivated. They will pick and choose policy options. They will not conform to neat twentieth-century distinctions because experience has taught them to be wary of such things. None of this means they think small - indeed their irritation with much of what passes for political campaigning is precisely because they believe the thinking is not big enough or broad enough to change lives. They are radical, not ideological. You can call this the radical centre, though that doesn't properly describe it. Such a radicalism is not positioned between traditional left/right but above it.

And here is a strange paradox. The real challenge for leaders is how to change their countries, yet first they have to persuade their own party base, since party organisations have the ability to determine the contenders for leadership;

and though the people distrust ideologically driven politics, party activists are even more wedded to them. The party battle then turns into a series of set-piece staged fights, a bit like re-enactments of English or American civil wars. What comes out of it is a form of transactional politics in which the risk is that even if you start with the right answer, it's slowly whittled away into mush. Meanwhile, in the real world, this unstoppable force of change is beating down upon us, demanding something transformative in order to cope with it.

Democracy is supported for two reasons (and by the way supported the world over - no nation that is a democracy has ever chosen willingly to surrender it, and no two democracies have ever gone to war): the first is justice - it is the fairest way to choose a government; the second has been efficiency. Dictatorships, at least over time, tend to inefficiency, corruption and repression.

The challenge of modern democracy is efficacy. Not accountability, transparency or whether it is honest or not, but whether it works to deliver effective change in times that need that radical change. It is here that our traditions weigh us down. We have inherited very binary, polar two-party politics or, even where there are more than two parties, very stratified veins of left and right. What's more, our systems were designed when politics was a 'later in life' mission; it is now a career that often starts shortly after university and progresses through a series of political posts until the summit is reached. Checks and balances are there for very good reasons in most constitutional democracies; but in the modern world they often lead not to consensus for change but to sclerosis or minimal change. Above all, over a period of years since the war as the state has grown and public services and welfare systems have developed, there is a vast network of special interests that have every incentive to defend the status quo vigorously, and virtually none to alter it or even adjust it.

Some of these state systems are extraordinarily complex. Reforming them is intellectually, as well as politically, profoundly challenging. To get that right requires great effort and space – political space in which things can be thoroughly explored, iterated and reiterated. The answers matter. They have effects that don't just run into billions of pounds or dollars or euros but affect lives. But without care, even the act of intellectual inquiry is itself demonised.

Politicians – especially when trying to reform complicated systems built up over decades that employ thousands and impact upon millions – require the brains of the best talents. It should be a national enterprise driven by a shared sense of purpose. Creating the means of achieving this is near to impossible the way we do politics right now. Outsiders come in usually from a genuine sense of patriotic endeavour. Their motives are rubbished, their backgrounds scrutinised to the point of obloquy and pretty soon they wonder why on earth they ever got mixed up in it all.

The gene pool going into politics is now frighteningly limited. This is not because there is a reduced desire for public service. It is that too many smart people no longer see it as public service – they're wrong in that, by the way, but that's how a lot of people who otherwise might well be tempted, resist the temptation.

The way modern parliaments work has also changed. I don't mean in terms of procedures and so on – they are all too familiar – but in terms of how they function in practical ways. Very few listen to parliamentary debates any more. Press releases matter more than considered speeches. Getting re-elected, fund-raising, building networks of supporters, can be almost a full-time occupation today. In other words, the time for the real job – which, just to recall, is participating as an elected national political leader in national debates – comes a poor second to the business of staying there.

The way our democracies work in the early twenty-first century is virtually a conspiracy against rational decision-making. In times when the political system needs to roll along because we're doing fine and, frankly, the less done the better - and there are such times - these flaws of modern democratic politics do not matter so much. Today they do.

Now, in saying all this, I've not gone soft. I spent twenty-five years in politics. I know the game; it's competitive and occasionally brutal. It's always been like that. But here's the difference today: these are times in which we need to effect radical change. In this regard Europe and America face the same challenges. In Europe it is absolutely plain that the crisis in the eurozone has merely exposed, not originated, the need for reform. The truth is that welfare and public service systems over the years have grown up to become wholly different from the original conception. To have debates over whether to raise the retirement age by one or two years with generous pension provisions is next to absurd. Life expectancy has dramatically altered, while the birth rate is lower. You simply can't, therefore, have smaller numbers of working-age people supporting larger numbers of the retired. Public services that, when first created, were basic services, which were a momentous advance for a generation that had nothing, are never going to satisfy a generation that in the rest of its life has a vast array of choices, preferences, individualised service and custom, and will expect and demand the same from state services for which they pay their taxes.

I follow the debate about the US deficit with a degree of bewilderment, as befits the foreigner. Some say: isn't it a trifle weird to have such a fierce debate about \$30 billion vs \$60 billion vs \$100 billion of cuts to discretionary spending, when the issue is a trillion-dollar budget deficit?

This concern has increased with the ratings agencies now suggesting that the AAA rating of US debt is at risk of

downgrade. The European Stability Framework has now been announced, reannounced and again reannounced. On each occasion, the time lag between initial relief and then later disappointment is getting shorter. That is because people know - and in this case, at least, the markets are not behaving irrationally - that the social and economic systems in Europe need fundamental reform and the euro needs an alignment of fiscal and monetary policy.

So I believe there is a systemic political challenge that is about how we mature and modernise our democracies to include not just the form of democracy - voting for the governments - but the substance underpinning it. In a world that is transforming, we cannot govern ourselves with transactional politics, otherwise we will find our Western leadership position not merely assailed - as in a sense it is bound to be - but corroded to the point where the twenty-first century happens on someone else's terms.

This is where we need to rise above partisan politics - which is not as quixotic as it may sound. Look at certain currents in politics right now and you can see a genuine new politics straining at the leash: New Labour, the new Democrats of President Clinton's time and the movement that brought President Obama to power, all consciously reached out beyond their traditional base; there is the coalition government in the UK, and perhaps more interesting the involvement of former Labour ministers in making long-term government policy; President Sarkozy's inclusion of Socialist Party members in his government; the bipartisan efforts of Simpson-Bowles and the six senators on the US deficit. Where political leaders deliberately go outside their own political base, they almost always win public approval. The very fact of overtly embracing bipartisanship would itself create confidence economically as well as politically. It would give people the sense that politics was rising to the challenge.