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ABSTRACT

Title: The Analysis of United Kingdom Defence Policy Under Tony Blair (2001-2007) and David Cameron (2010-2016) Administration In The Case of 9/11 and Arab Spring

Ever since the end of the Cold War, especially after 9/11 attack in 2001, the security in world politics has become more complex. This has urged world leaders, including Tony Blair and David Cameron to maintain strong and firm defence policy as the main tool to deter the threats posed to UK. The emergence of the uprising during Arab Spring also brought the impact towards the security of UK. Terrorism as the effect of 9/11 and dictatorship in the emergence of Arab Spring were perceived threatening UK national security and national interest. Hence, building the security relations with regional organizations is deem necessary for UK to form a strong alliance to also deter the threats. However, defence policy implemented by states is most likely affected by the idiosyncratic factors or personal characteristics of the leaders.

This particular research centered upon the explanation of the relations between the idiosyncratic factors of Tony Blair and David Cameron with the defence policy implementation as the response of 9/11 and Arab Spring, by analyzing the threat perception, national interest, and strategic environment of the leaders. The time frame of the research is the second to third term of Blair administration (2001-2007) and the first to early second term of Cameron’s administration (2010-2016). Qualitative method with the descriptive order will be utilized to analyze the defence policy implementation during the two former prime ministers administration. This research aims to find the similarities or differences of the defence policy implemented by Tony Blair and David Cameron during their administration.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I.1 Background of the Study

United Kingdom (UK) is recognized as one of the influential countries in international politics. The victory gained by UK during several considered battles in the past also contributed its hegemony in international stage, regardless the damages caused by those battles. By having such hegemony in the region, it is important for UK to ensure its security from any kind of harm, either from domestic or external sphere\(^1\).

However, the wider the influence, the more possible that the national interests of UK could be affected. As one of the major paradigms in international relations, Realism argued that the state will be more focusing on the struggle for power in order to expand the influence. This influence is basically a tool for a state to obtain the interests. Nonetheless, the recognition of UK’s influence in international politics will urge the Royal Government\(^2\) to consider internal and even external matters that pose probable threats towards UK’s interests. From here, the existence of state’s national interests will further become its national security as well, that necessary to be pursued.

State, to this extent, is believed to be the major actor who can ensure the security of the country and its people itself\(^3\). By establishing strong and firm policy upon certain matters is one of the efforts to secure states’ national interests and national security, including through defence policy. The significance of defence policy is basically to defend the national

---

\(^1\) The statement derived from Susan Strange (1987) who mentioned that ‘United States ensures its hegemonic capacity through its own structural power enabled by security.’ The idea of this is basically applied generally, not only for United States, but also for other hegemonic nation-state in other region, including UK

\(^2\) The government of UK

interests along with state’s national values and to defend the Armed Forces and the people of the state. However, there is one unique point upon the study of defence policy, that it is dependable on who holds the reign of a nation-state. It has the meaning that, defence policy of one state is dynamic from one reign to another reign. No exception for UK.

The premiership alterations in UK have witnessed different emphasis in its defence sector. As for instance, the premiership of Tony Blair from 2001-2007\(^4\) and David Cameron’s reign from 2010-2015\(^5\) posed different focus of its defence posture and defence policy upon political constellation in international stage during their tenure. The dynamics in defence sector between the premierships are feasible due to the different perception of strategic environment\(^6\) and threats. The nature of the strategic environment, both in terms of present concerns and likely future scenarios, is argued as the basis upon which political choices and objectives are defined by a government\(^7\). Also, the perception of threats by each Premier will lead into different political decisions, including what kind of proper defence policy to be applied in order to address the perceived threats.

UK, from long ago, has engaged in many global affairs which involved its neighboring countries\(^8\). Its involvement in mitigating international security issues has brought UK to the point of others’ security problems would become our problems as well. If other countries and/or regions which possess UK’s national interests could not address their problems, it would harm the UK as it has relation with the referred countries and/or regions. Therefore, basically, the most pressing threats for UK are

\(^4\) Blair’s premiership was began in 1997 when the Labour party won the election. However, the analysis of this research will be focusing on his second and third term of premiership, starting from 2001 until 2007

\(^5\) David Cameron was re-elected as UK’s Prime Minister in 2015, yet he resigned from his position in 2016 since the referendum held by the UK which resulted its withdrawal from European Union or so called the phenomenon of Brexit “Britain Exit”


\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Its permanent membership in United Nations Security Council since 1945 shows UK’s prominent role in mitigating international security issues
coming from the lack of ability of other countries and region to manage their own problems.

Tracing back to the phenomenon of 11 September, 2001 (9/11) which has caused ruckus within the international world, apparently has slightly shaped Western nation-states’ policy, including UK and most notably Tony Blair’s policy. United States’ Global War on Terrorism policy has at least affected Tony Blair’s decision to enhance the security of Britain soil. Tony Blair’s foreign policy was more to interventionist and multilateral, which also directly brought impacts to both the direction of UK’s defence policy and on the role and nature of British Armed Forces.

According to Strategic Trends document published by Joint Doctrine and Concepts Centre in March 2003, the greatest risk to UK security is derived from the strategic environment changing faster than the government could acquire and/or apply the resources to address the threat. Generally, the document concluded that the following trends will probably affect the future of UK’s defence and security policy up to the year of 2030:

- Increased destructive power of the asymmetric threat from terrorists and/or hostile states to UK homeland and overseas interests;
- Greater requirement for UK Armed Forces to operate in complex terrain;
- Increasing turbulence worldwide with persistent low intensity threats;
- Likely new nuclear and WME (Weapons of Mass Effect) powers;
- Proliferation of new technologies which could be used by future adversaries;

---

10 It is seen through the armed forces deployment to Afghanistan that firstly done during Tony Blair’s tenure as an effort to support United States’ Global War on Terrorism policy
11 Ibid.
12 It is a think thank in Ministry of Defence of UK. It was established as the result of 1998 Strategic Defence Review under Blair’s first term premiership. This think thank is now so called Development, Concepts, and Doctrine Centre (DCDC)
• Failing states becoming a greater threat to global security than resurgent ones;
• The US-declared ‘global war on terrorism’ and ongoing military transformation programme would significantly alter future United States concepts, diplomacy and global military footprint;
• Increasing mutual antagonism between Islamic and Western cultures;
• Increasing calls for humanitarian intervention and assistance overseas;
• New environments for conflict: space and cyberspace.

Whereas, compare to the early premiership of David Cameron which began in 2010, he addressed that the Royal Government will continue several inheritances of the previous government, for instance the military missions in Afghanistan which deployed firstly in 2001 during Tony Blair’s second term premiership. Cameron argued that by conducting difficult military missions from the predecessors has brought UK’s economy in to an imbalance, therefore he was committed to restructure their economy to be back on track.

“The difficult legacy we have inherited has necessitated tough decisions to get our economy back on track. Our national security depends on our economic security and vice versa. So bringing the defence budget back to balance is a vital part of how we tackle the deficit and protect this country’s national security.”13

In 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR), besides terrorism issue which assumed as Tier One risk in National Security Risk Assesment14, most of the tasks were to reform the previous legacy in defence sector. The Armed Forces personnel and military equipment – besides terrorism issues – got the most attention from the Royal Government. The government under David Cameron perceived that there were too many inefficiencies, or so called the legacy of over-commitment of the deployment of military forces and utilization of military equipment

---

13 Foreword of David Cameron in 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review: Securing Britain in an Age of Uncertainty
14 Ibid, p.41
which burden the government in the end. Due to these matters, as outlined in 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review, there will be some reduction of service personnel taken until 2015 at around a total of 17,000 personnel.\(^\text{15}\)

As what have mentioned before, different perception of each UK Prime Ministers upon the strategic environment and the poses threats, internally and externally, has shaped differences in the country’s defence policy. Tony Blair’s perception compare to David Cameron’s perception would be different since there were changes in UK strategic and security environment during their tenure.

### 1.2 Identification of the Problem

Both Tony Blair and David Cameron were experiencing the aftermath of World Trade Center attack in 2001. Tony Blair, who was re-elected as the Prime Minister for the second time in 2001, was definitely altered and reformed his defence policy towards international security issues, as Blair also aimed to further strengthen UK’s relationship with United States. By publishing A New Chapter to the Strategic Defence Review in 2002, Blair’s government asserted that overseas operations Post-September 11 will be a more effective use of the military in fighting terrorism than home defence\(^\text{16}\). That 2002 Strategic Defence Review was assumed as a new chapter of 1998 Strategic Defence Review, not the new one, as it is aimed to rebalance government’s existing efforts and to look hard on government’s priorities for the plans and programs\(^\text{17}\).

---


\(^{17}\) UK Secretary of State for Defence’s, Rt Hon Geoffrey Hoon, statement in the House of Commons in 2001.
Due to the 9/11 event, Blair has decided to begin overseas Armed Forces deployment as one of the efforts to counter the accused Islamic organizations as the perpetrator of the attack that the implications could be brought to Britain soil as well. The major deployments were headed to Afghanistan and Iraq, where the 9/11 attack was alleged done by Al Qaeda\(^\text{18}\) and its affiliate, the Taliban. Armed Forces deployment by British government was firstly held under US-led and then followed under NATO operation. This overseas deployment was definitely cost the government lots of budget and military equipment. The figure below shows the Afghanistan operation costs held by UK government in the range of time of 2001-2012.

By referring to that figure, it was actually showing the data of Afghanistan operation costs from three different United Kingdom prior Prime Ministers, Tony Blair from 2001-2007, Gordon Brown from 2007-

\(^{18}\) An Islamic organization based in Afghanistan. Founded by Osama bin Laden in 1988.
2010, and David Cameron from 2010-2012\textsuperscript{19}. However, the data is only showed to see the operation cost under Blair only, which from 2001-2007 the average operation cost was increasing. However, Afghanistan operation cost under Blair was much lower as it was the initiation of the operation compare to the two latter Prime Ministers. From this figure only, it can be seen that through the occurance of 9/11 attack in United States, Blair has taken one major decision that turned out applied by his successors in the next years.

By seeing this overseas military operation only, it shows that the government should really concern about their policy in regards to defence and security, notably when it comes to overseas military deployment. The decided policy, might be encompassing defence budget and defence measurement will determine how the UK could be stable economically while its defence and security objectives are well-maintained.

However, overseas military deployment is not the only problem that the state should concern about. The relationship UK built with several regional organizations, such as the European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) should also be considered in each premier’s policy. UK was in advantageous position in terms of relations with international organization, as it is the only country who at the same time was the member of United Nations (particularly its Security Council), EU, and NATO.

Both Blair and Cameron government have been considering EU and NATO within their defence policy structure, Blair in his 2003 New Chapter of Strategic Defence Review and Cameron in his 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review. Again, the different perception of each premier upon UK’s relations with EU and NATO will define how their relations towards the two organization would take form in the future during their tenure.

\textsuperscript{19}The data stopped during David Cameron tenure as it only shows operation cost up until the year of 2012
The significance of EU and NATO in determining UK’s influence in international stage cannot be neglected. UK membership within the two prominent regional organizations—which could be said was established upon different objectives and interests—would affect policy sector a lot. UK eminent position within the NATO is undoubtedly, even though the alliance is more dominated by the United States. Moreover, during Cameron tenure, he was aiming to meet NATO target of spending 2% of Gross Domestic Products (GDP) on defence sector. According to Conservative manifesto:

“We will continue to ensure that defence policy remains firmly under British national control, maintaining NATO and the trans-Atlantic relationship as the cornerstones of our defence and security policy.”

Despite the importance of both organizations for UK, the different interests poses by the Royal government towards the organizations could also affect each premier defence policy. NATO since its establishment in 1949, was definitely affected UK defence policy as it is one of the founding states of the alliance. By committing to create the alliance, UK shall not abandon the interests of NATO and its member countries. Moreover, based on Article 5 of North Atlantic Treaty, an attack towards one member country of NATO means attack for all of the member countries as well. Here prevail, “all for one and one for all” collective vow, which means UK should actively involve in mitigating other member countries’ security problems. This position in the alliance will definitely cost UK some spending and its capacity.

Meanwhile, EU which was solely established to foster the economy of its member countries is now encompassing security matters as well,

---

22 Ibid.
which reflected upon its Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP)\textsuperscript{24} as its efforts to assure the defence and security sectors, in order to counter the internal and external threats towards its member countries in the region. It is believed that, a greater integrated EU would allow UK to retain its position as a considered power in the region. Also, as one of the most experienced military power within the union, UK will be able to translate the experiences as military leadership in the region if it is willing to engage in European defence initiatives. This will also lead UK to widen its influence towards the world and thus will help UK to achieve its national interests and national security objectives.

Political background between the two prime ministers also cannot be neglected as it will affect on how the individuals, Blair and Cameron react upon certain international security issues. Blair who was backed by Labour party could have different perception with Cameron who was supported by Conservative party. Historically, Labour and Conservative parties were so contrast in several aspects, economically and politically. For instance, in terms of UK engagement with European Union, the Labour-ists were basically oppose to the idea, while the Conservatists were more supported the engagement of the union with UK. In the economic perspective, Labour is believed to be more socialist ideologically as it emphasizes the welfare of the poor more and fair distribution of the wealth. Meanwhile, Conservative is assumed to be the proponent of Capitalism.

Therefore, the differences or even similarities between defence policy under Tony Blair and David Cameron could be caused by several problems; the changing strategic environment of UK during their tenure, each premier idiosyncratic factors, different political background of the premier, and its relations with several regional organization. The general idea of comparison between two premiers’ defence policy is summed up into their variance of threat perception.

\textsuperscript{24} Previously called European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)
I.3 Statement of the Problem

By referring to the stated problems above, the author has set one research question to be answered in this research as follows:

“What are the differences or similarities between Tony Blair (2001-2007) and David Cameron’s (2010-2016) defence policy during their tenure as Prime Minister in UK?”

I.4 Research Objectives

In accordance to the title of this research and the statement of the problem, the author aims to explain the similarities and differences of UK’s defence policy under the tenure of Tony Blair and David Cameron as UK Prime Minister.

I.5 Significance of the Study

By conducting this research, the study aims to give understanding upon the similarities and differences of UK defence policy under the tenure of two prior prime ministers, Tony Blair and David Cameron.

I.6 Theoretical Framework

In order to understand and to answer the research question, it is imperative to provide adequate theories and concepts applied in International Relations. By combining theories and several concepts, it attempts to strengthen the argument of this study. In accordance to the title of this research, the first concept of framework that the author will utilize to conduct this study is individual decision maker that concern with the idiosyncratic factors and personal characteristics of the leaders. Besides, there will be one other theory and one concept that will be used for the explanation; Realism and defence policy concept as the research is analyzing the differences and similarities of UK defence policy under two Prime Ministers.
I.6.1 Individual Decision Maker

As the analysis of defence policy is closely related to foreign policy, several concepts of defence policy in this search will also refer to the analysis of foreign policy. Goldstein argued in his book about how individuals make the decisions on behalf of the state by picturing Harry Truman decision to drop nuclear bombs towards two cities in Japan during World War II\textsuperscript{25}:

“If he chose to use the bomb (as he did), more than 100,000 civilians would die. If he chose not to, the war might drag on for months with tens of thousands of US causalties. Truman had to choose. Some people applaud his decision, others condemn it. But for better or worse, Truman as an individual had to decide, and to take responsibility of the consequences...”

From that foreign policy analysis concept, the individual decision maker concepts could also be applied in the analysis of defence policy. As the research is trying to explain the differences and similarities of defence policy under Tony Blair and David Cameron, this concept will further be elaborated through idiosyncracy of leaders concept. Generally, the explanation of the individual decision maker concept can be seen in this figure below:

Figure I.2 is an elaboration from several concepts proposed by several analysts. Individual decision maker here reflects the stance of Blair and Cameron as they were the leaders of UK who have wide decision latitude, were forced to define the situation of UK, and were likely play role in the decision making for UK, including the defence policy.

The individual decision maker analysis is affected by at least three factors, such as beliefs, motives, and the idiosyncrasies of the leaders. Hermann explained about beliefs and motives as two from four types of personal characteristics owned by leaders in terms of the decision making. Beliefs and motives of the leaders represent their view of the world. She mentioned in her writings:

“Beliefs refer to a political leader’s fundamental assumptions about the world. Are events predictable, is conflict basic to human interaction, can one have control over some events, is the maintenance of national sovereignty and and superiority the most important objective of a nation? Beliefs are proposed by many to affect political leader’s interpretation of his environment and, in turn, the strategies that the leader employs.” “Need for power is

---


27 Ibid.
probably the most discussed motive with reference to political leaders. But others, such as need for affiliation and need for approval, also appear regularly in such writings. Motives appear to affect political leader’s interpretations of their environment and the strategies they use.”

Afterwards, each leaders were also analyzed to have idiosyncratic factors which seen could affect their decision making. The explanation of idiosyncratic factors of leaders will be explained in the next sub-sub chapter.

I.6.1.1 Idiosyncrasy of Leaders

Idiosyncratic analysis is the study of the humans as individuals and how each leaders’ personal characteristics help shape his or her decisions (Renshon & Larshon, 2002). As has been showed in the figure I.2, there are five considerable factors in terms of idiosyncracy analysis; personality, physical and mental helath, ego and ambition, political history and personal experience, and perceptions and operational reality. Those five factors can be used to further elaborate the linkage between how the idiosyncratic factors of individuals (leaders) can affect the decision making process.

**Personality**

When studying personality types and their impacts on policy, scholars examine a leader’s basic orientations toward self and toward other, behavioral patterns, and attitude about such politically relevant concepts as authority (Dyson, 2006). According to Barber (1985), scholars have favored active-positive leaders categorization. Active leaders are defined as policy innovators and positive leaders are defined as have egos strong enough to enjoy (or at least accept) the contentious political environment.

---

28 Ibid. Pg. 8-9
Physical and Mental Health

Rourke argued physical and mental health of the leader affect his or her decision making. He put an example as the explanation of this point from Franklin D. Roosevelt, who was so ill of hypertension during war times in 1945, that the historian concludes that Roosevelt was “in no condition to govern the republic”. He also added that leaders are sometime suffer from mental or psychological problems. He took United States former President Richard Nixon case, who was an inebriate and was reportedly incapacitated during international crisis with the Soviet Union (Schulzinger, 1978).

Ego and Ambition

Rourke argued in his book by taking George H. W. Bush’s story in Panama and Persian Gulf Crisis cases that reflect his ego and ambition in deciding policy. He argued,

“He came to office in 1989 with a reputation for being wishy-washy, and Newsweek even ran a picture of him with a banner, “The Wimp Factor,” on its cover. Arguably an ego-wounded Bush responded by being too tough. He soon invaded Panama, and the following year in the Persian Gulf crisis his fierce determination not to negotiate with Iraq left it little choice but to fight or capitulate. Certainly, it would be outrageous to claim that Bush decided on war only to assuage his ego. But it would be naive to ignore the possible role of this factor. In fact, after defeating Panama and Iraq, the president displayed a prickly pride when he told reporters, “You’re talking to the wimp . . . to the guy that had a cover of a national magazine …put that label on me. And now some that saw that we can react when the going gets tough maybe have withdrawn that allegation.”

Political History and Personal Experience

This is another important point in the analysis of idiosyncratic factors that affect leaders’ decision making ability. Again, Rourke took an example from The Bush story in leading the U.S. Some analysts argued that young Bush was driven by his personal
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30 The 41st President of United States of America who also is the father of the 43rd President of US, George W. Bush
experience in toppling down Saddam Husein from power, as Saddam was widely believed has attempted to murder young Bush’s father in 1993. This could be one of the reasons, asides the political reasons on why he was so eager in deposing Saddam from the throne during his tenure.

**Perceptions and Operational Reality**

The sum of a leader’s perceptions creates his or her worldview (Hermann & Keller, 2004). Perceptions will further create Operational Reality which this idea basically means that policy makers tend to act based on their perceptions, despite its accuracy.  

I.6.2 **Realism**

Realism or so called Political Realism in general is believed as the proper theory that could explain international relations. Basically, most of the strands of Realism have similar points in formulating and developing the theory itself. The importance of power, security, and national interest for the state, that the states are not self-sufficient, and that the state is the primary actor recognized in international politics are the main claims in most of Realist house. Jack Donelly mentioned in a collective book, “in International Relations, political realism is a tradition of analysis that stresses the imperatives states face to pursue power politics of national interest.”

He also stated the relations between international politics and the actors involved within as statesmanship, which is basically an act to mitigate and maintain conflicts, not eliminating it. It is also seeking a less dangerous world, rather than a safe, just, or even peaceful one (Donelly: 2005).

---

32 Ibid, pp.76  
I.6.2.1 Structural Realism

Particularly, this research will use Structural Realism or also prominent as Neo-Realism which proposed by Kenneth Waltz in 1979 to elaborate the analysis. Main assumption about Waltz’s Structural Realism is on the nature of international conflict and the definition of power. He believed that international conflict and war occurred in international system was caused by the ‘anarchical’ nature – the absence of international government of international system. However, anarchy is not the only option for international system, hierarchical system is also exist. Waltz argued that, in hierarchical system, different kind of units are organized under a clear line of authority. Due to this anarchical system, states become more concern about the relations with other states and are prone to preserve its national interests as the effort to ensure its security in international politics.

According to Waltz’s Structural Realism, the international system is a ‘self-help’ system. It is a system where every unit must “put itself in a position to be able to take care of its self since no one can be counted on to do so” (1979:107). Edward A. Kolodziej argued upon the definition of ‘self-help’ system as below,

“No state can ever fully trust another to resist encroaching on its vital interests, nor can it rely on other states to come to its aid when their own vital interests, security, and survival are put in peril.”

This argument will lead states to have concern upon their security as well as considering other states as the potential threats, both to the national interests and further the national security.

The relation between several points highlighted from Waltz’s Structural Realism with the changing or continued of UK defence policy is that the decision makers, here the two prior Prime Ministers deemed defence policy as a tool to protect the national interests and further state’s national security, or shortly a mean to survive in international politics.

I.6.3 Defence Policy

When it comes to the discussion of defence policy, it is best to utilize the concept of strategic environment. Strategic environment is basically a tool to understand the international relations and by assessing it, it could determine state’s ability to survive in international politics. The discussion of strategic environment is closely related with threat perception concept. Before moving further to the explanation, the general scheme is shown in the figure below.

![Figure I.3 General figure for defence policy concept explained by Professor Anak Agung Banyu Perwita, PhD and further elaborated by the author](image)

From the figure above, we can see the linkage of three important factors in the analysis of defence policy: strategic environment, threat perception, and the policy output. Lindsay Harris argued that strategic environment is the crucial determinant of the information that is available to an actor and the structure within which actors operate. The environment determines what the actors think they know for sure and what they have to
infer, if possible, from the behavior of others. By assessing strategic environment, the involving actors, be it the state itself and the leaders, are most likely considering both external and internal environment of its territory.

The assessment of strategic environment will lead the actors to perceive any kind of factors that have the potential in harming the national interests of the state. Threats can take two forms, verbal and physical. Verbal threats are conditional statements designed to signal the capacity and intention to inflict harm if the desired results are not forthcoming. Meanwhile, physical threats or Stein called it as non-verbal threats could have the meaning that there are physical acts which signaled serious intention of the ‘threat-sender’, for instance the withdrawal of the ambassadors, position their forces in alert for military action, or move the forces to the contested borders.

By the perceived possible threats, either from external or internal sphere of the state, then the actors –here the state leaders- will need to conduct decision making process in which certain policies are going to be formulated to deter the threats. In order to do so, there are several questions that needed to be considered during the process. The questions were proposed by Laura R. Cleary as shown in the figure below:
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Threat assessment is basically aiming to identify challenges, risks and threats, as well as strengths and to determine the extent that national, regional, and international factors will influence the security of the state (Joint Doctrine and Concepts Centre, 2003). In UK Ministry of Defence, along with other ministries of the state, they set seven dimension in terms of threat assessment point: physical; technological; economic; social and cultural; legal, moral and ethical; political; military. In regards to defence choices and its political consequences, Carl Von Clausewitz has stated that war was a continuation of politics by other means. This means that, every leaders should aware that any defence choices will have political consequences in the future. For instance, how one state defence choices could affect further diplomatic ties with other state.

After deciding defence choices point, the government should also concern upon whether to use military or non-military tools to deter the threats. Ideally, the usage of non-military and military strategy should be complementary. However, the decision to use military or non-military tools can be affected from different views of different departments in the government. Some might argue that by using military tools, it will escalate the threat to the state, and some other might argue by using non-military tools, it could prevent the conflict without damaging and cost the state too much. Afterwards, the resources to be used to foster defence and security should also be considered. It is generally believed that economic growth and security are related to one another. Inadequate security will lessen the probability of investment, but over-spending on defence sector alone could shake the economy by raising taxes and depressing consumption (Laura & Teri, 2006).
Lastly, military forces was also designed to conduct non-military purposes. In several countries, its military forces were sent to build roads and bridges and even to provide Humanitarian and Disaster Relief. However, it should be borne in mind that the more military forces deployed to non-military purposes could minimize military effectiveness and debilitate other services.\footnote{Cleary, L. R. (2006). Managing Defence in Democracy. Pg.42. New York: Routledge.}

From the brief explanation of figure I.4, readers can actually find the connection of that figure with figure I.3 (general figure of defence policy analysis). Five points mentioned in figure I.4 are basically the general discussion in two points (Strategic Environment and Threat Perception) of figure I.3, before the defence policy formulated by the leaders.

\section*{I.6.4 Research Framework}

As mentioned previously, there are three theories and concepts that will be utilized in this research. The first theory is Structural Realism which has three main assumptions that will be emphasized in, namely anarchical system, ‘self-help’ system, and the survival. This anarchical structure of international system will lead the political leaders as the representatives of the state to fulfill the security of the state by deciding certain policy to be implemented, particularly defence policy as the main tool to survive in the international politics, in order to deter any possible factors that could harm the security of the state itself. The whole theories and concept utilized in this research can be seen from the framework below. It explains the linkage of each theory as well as the concepts.
Afterwards, as the analysis of defence policy is also emphasizing on three aforementioned factors, the leaders, threat perception, and the policy outcome, author deems necessary to picture the linkage of the concepts which related to the analysis of defence policy in order to give a much clearer understanding upon the used theories and concepts.

Basically, figure I.6 is the elaboration of several important points in the defence policy-related concepts by several analysts. Individual decision maker here represents the leaders of the state, which in this very research is
analyzing about Blair and Cameron, will be much influenced by their beliefs and motives for the certain cases. The beliefs and motives are shaping the view of the leaders about the world and particularly the environment surrounding them. This view will then create a certain perception of the leaders upon the possible threats that might be posed towards UK. Therefore, this threat perception eventually becomes the basis for the leaders to implement the defence policy outcome.

I.7 Scope and Limitation of the Study

Realizing the two different premierships of UK in the study of defence policy, the author has decided several limitation in this research, in order to gain specific explanation upon the question stated. With the title of “The Analysis of UK Defence Policy under Tony Blair (2001-2007) and David Cameron (2010-2016) Administration in The Case of 9/11 and Arab Spring”, the author will be focusing on the comparison of defence policy applied by the two Prime Ministers. The time limitation for Tony Blair analysis (2001-2007) is set due to the occurrence of 9/11 attack in United States in 2001 which argued has shaped UK policy and it was his second term of premiership in UK that ended closely with the beginning of David Cameron premiership. Afterwards, the time limitation for David Cameron analysis (2010-2015) is thus set, as it was his tenure of premiership in UK and 2010 marked the phenomenon of Arab Spring that also believed was affecting international relations a lot.

I.8 Research Methodology

In order to find the answer of the research question and to explain the analysis, this study will utilize qualitative method of research. Qualitative research attempts to answer questions by “examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings.” (Berg: 2001, p.66-67)
According to C.R Kothari (Former Principal, College of Commerce University of Rajasthan, India) within his book which entitled *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2004), he described:

“Descriptive research includes surveys and fact-finding enquiries of different kinds. The major purpose of descriptive research is description of the state of affairs as it exists at present. In social science and business research we quite often use the term Ex post facto research for descriptive research studies. The main characteristics of this method is that the researcher has no control over the variables; he/she can only report what has happened or what is happening. Most Ex post facto research projects are used for descriptive studies in which the researcher seeks to measure such terms as, for example, frequency of shopping, preference of people, or similar data. Ex post facto studies also include attempts by researchers to discover causes even when they cannot control the variables. The methods of research utilized in descriptive research are survey methods of all kinds, including comparative and co-relational methods. In analytical research, on the other hand, the researcher has to use facts or information already available, and analyze these to make a critical evaluation of the material.”

I.9  Structure of the Thesis

**CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION**

In this first chapter, the general overview of the research will be introduced by providing essential information in regards to the research. This will include the background of the study, the identification of the problem, statement of the problem, research objectives, significance of the study, theoretical framework, scope and limitation of the study, research methodology, and the structure of the thesis itself. The chapter is basically intended to give knowledge to the readers on the conducted research.

**CHAPTER II IDIOSYNCRATIC FACTORS OF TONY BLAIR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF UK DEFENCE POLICY (2001-2007)**

As the research is trying to find the differences or similarities of UK defence policy, this chapter will try to analyze the idiosyncratic factors of Tony Blair, be it his personality, psychological aspect, educational
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background, political background, and so on, in perceiving international politics during his tenure. Also, in this part there will be explained how international event, that is the 9/11 attack, affect his decision by using the mentioned general figure of defence policy analysis.

CHAPTER III IDIOSYNCRATIC FACTORS OF DAVID CAMERON IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF UK DEFENCE POLICY (2010-2016)

It is imperative to analyze David Cameron’s as well. During his tenure, there happened the Arab Spring which believed has shaped his perception upon international politics and his defence policy. Therefore, this chapter will try to link that event with his defence policy formulation and idiosyncratic factors which consist of equal elements as in Blair’s analysis.


After comparing the idiosyncratic factors of both UK prior Prime Ministers, there will be founded the comparison on how was the defence policy under Tony Blair and David Cameron. This chapter will try to provide the clear results of differences or similarities, the changing or continuing defence policy during both Premiers tenure.

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION

The conclusion and final statement of this research will be written in this chapter. The summary of all chapters in this research and their linkage with the decided questions will also be provided within this chapter.
CHAPTER II

IDIOSYNCRATIC FACTORS OF TONY BLAIR IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF UK DEFENCE POLICY (2001-2007)

II.1 Tony Blair’s Profile

Tony Blair’s former position as UK Prime Minister could not be detached from his personal background. He was taking the office for three periods of length, starting from 1997 until 2007. The policies he has decided for UK might be the results of how was his educational background in the past or even how was childhood. Those factors are included in the idiosyncrasies of leaders which would be further used to analyze leaders’ policies in international politics. Therefore, this chapter will try to explore Blair’s idiosyncratic factors in implementing UK defence policy during his second and third tenure in 2001-2007, along with the explanation of several cases to see how was his policy particularly.

II.1.1 Early Years

Tony Blair was born on 6 May, 1953 in Edinburgh, Scotland as the second son from three, with his full name Anthony Charles Lynton Blair. Blair spent his first few years in Adelaide, Australia as his father lectured on law in the city’s university. He then moved and spent most of the time in Durham, England before he committed into a more serious stage of his life. He went to St. John’s College at Oxford University. He achieved his law degree with interests in religious ideas from that college45. Influenced by his father, Leo Blair who was a British barrister and also a former law lecturer at Durham University, Tony Blair was encouraged to join local politics in Britain as his father could not do46.

However, way before he got involved in British politics, Blair’s story and background which filled with love, loss, and living have colored his future experiences in international politics. During his schooldays, Blair was eminent with his cheeky and rebellious figure who loved to be in the center of attention among his peers. Blair’s housemaster in Edinburgh boarding school, Eric Anderson told the biographer:

“Tony was full of life. Maddening at times, full of himself and very argumentative.” “He was an expert at testing the rules to the limit, and I wouldn’t swear that he stuck rigidly to the rules on not drinking, smoking or breaking bounds. But he was a live wire and fun to have around.”

Blair was also recognized by his friends as amiable and has good personality, despite his family background whose father and mother were ill. He was able to avoid some popular bad behaviour at that time, such as dealing with drugs. No one could remember him went too drunk, when his other friends were almost fall in unconsciousness.

In his first year at university, Blair met an Australian priest who become Blair’s discussion peer in deepening his Christian faith. Besides theology, Blair also debate social issues with him which later Blair remembered him as the one who awaken his interest in Christian socialism and desire in social change.

Young Blair graduated from Oxford in 1975. He then committed the internship in employment law cases and specialized in trade union under Queen Counsel Alexander “Derry” Irvine, who later become his first Lord Chancellor. Blair was recognized as a quick-learner and able to absorb difficult issues. Derry Irvine stated in The New Yorker in regards to Blair during his internship period:

[50] It is an American based magazine
“One of his principal skills was absorbing enormously complicated material. Make your best points on the issues—he was very good at that.”

When Blair was still at Oxford, her Irish-born mother, whose maiden name was Hazel Corscaden, died to a thyroid cancer after fighting it for five years. Not only that, his prominent-barrister-father also had to struggle with stroke, right about five or six years before his mother died, according to his brother, Bill Blair. From his father accident, Blair, along with his brother and sister have tried to overcome their financial issues of the family. Those two parental tragedies in the family during Blair’s young ages have been observed by many analysts as the rationales upon Blair’s ambition in political stage.

II.1.2 Political Background/Experiences

His father who was passed away in last 2012, has become one of the reasons why Blair involved in British politics during his young ages. As mentioned in the previous sub-chapter, his father, Leo Blair was a prominent Barrister in Britain. When Tony Blair was 10 years old, his father attempted to run as Member of Parliament (MP) backed by Tory party. However, Leo’s ambition to sit at the Parliament should be buried as he got stroke and left him unable to speak. From this tragedy, Blair stated, “I felt I could not let him down” since his father tried to encourage the children to involve in the politics as he could not do. His involvement in politics was becoming more intense after he married Cherrie Booth in 1980. He met Cherie, who was graduated from London School of Economics, during his internship with Queen Counsel Derry Irvine in employment law cases back then.
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54 Historically traced, Tory party was the initiation of contemporary Conservative party in British politics. This Tory party was basically prefer to maintain traditions and avoid changes and it was also monarchist. It then called as Conservative party began in 1834.
Tony Blair’s political experience could be traced into his early membership in local Labour party in late 1970s, shortly after he graduated from Oxford. He has observed the power of local miner community which was so important for Labour party existence at that time. The local miner was the main strength for Labour party during the era. However, in 1978, Labour party had to face loss upon the Tory or so called Conservative party, due to several strikes by the union. The crisis and loss in Labour party was seen by people in which the party was mainly under the control of the union.

In 1980, Blair began his attempt to secure a seat in the Parliament. He asked through his father-in-law to contact Tom Pendry, one of the Labour MP to help him for the Parliament in Beaconsfield. Pendry then brought Blair into a small tour to House of Commons and he advised him to join the forthcoming election in Beacosnfield. In his first election, Blair could not acquire the seat from only 10% of vote. However, from this occasion, Blair fortunately could impress Michael Foot, the Leader of Labour party at that time, and could gain profile in the office. With that impression, Foot even told Blair that he has “big future in politics”.

After failing the 1982 local election, Blair tried to stand in the next election in 1983. He found that there was an available seat in Sedgefield Parliament, a country near Durham where Blair spent most of his childhood. In this election, Blair was able to secure seat along with other 208 Labour MPs. Blair who joined Labour party since his early ages, was so concern on social rights and some analysts put him as one of the proponents of socialism.
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55 One of the cities in England
56 House of Commons is part of British parliamentary system. UK is applying Two House System of parliamentary, the House of Commons and the House of Lords. House of Commons is the lower house in British politics where 650 elected MPs (Member of Parliaments) meet to consider and propose new laws and is able to scrutinize government policies.
political ideology. Blair also stated about his socialism inclination in the House of Commons, in the year when he became the Labour MP:\footnote{Tony Blair in His Own Words. (2007, May 11). Retrieved from The Guardian: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2007/may/11/tonyblair.labour1}: 

“I am a socialist not through reading a textbook that has caught my intellectual fancy, nor through unthinking tradition, but because I believe that, at its best, socialism corresponds most closely to an existence that is both rational and moral. It stands for cooperation, not confrontation; for fellowship, not fear. It stands for equality”.

Blair’s political career had rapid increasing after he sat in the Parliament. In the same year Blair elected as the MP, Margaret Tatcher whose backed by Conservative party won the General Election as UK Prime Minister. This made Neil Kinnock chosen as the leader of govement opposition from Labour party\footnote{British politics and parliament has a system of official government and opposition government. The party that won most seat in the parliament will for the government, while the next most winning party will be called the opposition government. From the referred sentence, Labour party was the opposition since Tatcher was re-elected as the Prime Minister from Conservative party.}. Kinnock was a good relative of Blair. He also promoted Blair to take a chance to run for Shadow team\footnote{Shadow team or so called Shadow cabinet is another British politics and parliament system, in which the opposition government will apoint several MPs to be positioned in certain official government departments. This shadow cabinet have the duty to examine the work of each department, critically analyzes government decision and policies, and also develop policies in their specific areas.} for trade and industry. Becoming the Shadow team was a good stepping stone for Blair’s further political career after he got his post in the Parliament. With a good result of 77 votes, Blair could attain another new position as Shadow cabinet for trade and industry 1987. In the next year, Blair got another opportunity to pursue Shadow secretary of energy post. This position put Blair to shadow the Secretary of Energy at that time, Nigel Lawson.

Continuing to the dynamics of British politics, Labour party had to face another loss in 1992 General Election. That year’s election was won once again by the Conservative, resulting on the end of Tatcher’s power and the beginning of John Major premiership. The loss of Labour party in the election has brought Kinnock to resign and succeeded by John Smith as the
Opposition leader. In this occasion, Blair was appointed as the Shadow Home Secretary under John Smith.

However, John Smith sudden death in May 1994 due to the heart attack, has opened another opportunity for Blair. There has to be someone to fill the empty Labour throne after Smith’s. Therefore, in July 1994, Blair seized the chance and won by 57% of vote to be the leader of Labour party\(^\text{61}\).

In his early leadership in Labour, Blair has reformed several platforms in the party. He was able to revamp the constitution Clause IV which stated for the nationalization of the economy, such as the common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange; reduced links with trade unions; and obtained unprecedented commitments to free enterprise, anti-inflationary policies, aggressive crime prevention, and support for Britain’s integration into the European Union\(^\text{62}\). The alterations Blair made were somehow not supported by some of the party members, as Blair tried to bring a “New Labour”\(^\text{63}\) and bring a new image upon Labour party. Under Blair’s leadership, Labour was able to win over the Conservative in 1995 municipal elections and defeated Conservative in May 1997 General Elections.

II.1.3 Tony Blair’s Second and Third Term Premiership

As the Labour won 1997 General Election, the leader of the winning party, according to British political and parliamentary system will be chosen as the Prime Minister for UK. Blair won 179 majority seat in the House of Commons and became the youngest Prime Minister in British politics since 1812. Labour victory under Blair was the biggest parliamentary majority and largest majority party since 1935 in Labour history\(^\text{64}\). The era of Blair’s Premiership began here.


\(^{63}\) Several values in the Labour party are altered during Blair era, for instance Labour party’s rejection on UK’s membership in the European Union was changed under Blair leadership.

\(^{64}\) Ibid.
However, as this research is only focusing on the second term (2001-2005) and the third term (2005-2007) of Blair’s premiership, this sub-chapter would just briefly explain his first term as the Prime Minister.

From his first term of Premiership, Blair has altered and coined several policies. One of his security policies was that he signed the Maastricht Treaty’s social chapter in order to cease the conflict in Northern Ireland between the Republican and the Unionist\textsuperscript{65}. British-Irish council was also established under Blair’s first year Premiership which intended to bridging Northern Ireland with Wales, Scotland, and England\textsuperscript{66}. In terms of foreign affairs, Blair assumed that Britain should involve more in international politics. Some of his realization of that assumption was that Britain’s involvement in protecting Kosovo in 1999.

Facing the ups and downs during his first term Premiership, Blair was fortunately able to secure his seat in May 2001 General Election once again. He won 167 majority seat as Labour earned 10,724,953 of votes which equal with 40.7% of votes\textsuperscript{67}. In his second term of Premiership, he started to look at the international affairs more than before that may bring effects to Britain as well, unlike the previous term which his concern was mostly on internal affairs of UK.

Starting to consider the international affairs more than the previous term, Blair’s foreign policy was regarded as ‘interventionist’ policy or so called the ‘liberal intervensionist’\textsuperscript{68}. This interventionist policy could have been affected by his beliefs by tracing back to his early years of college life – during his intense discussion about Christianity faith with his fellow- His belief shaped his view about world as mentioned by Seldon ‘‘He

\textsuperscript{65} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{66} These three states formed what so called Great Britain in international politics. Meanwhile, UK is a territory where three states of Great Britain is added with Northern Ireland.
conceptualises the world as a struggle between good and evil in which his particular vocation is to advance the former.” (Seldon, 2005: 700). This interventionism view of foreign policy has directed how Blair run the government, particularly in terms of the engagement in international affairs.

During his second term of Premiership, there happened one of the events that affect not only UK, but the international relations in general, either theoretically or practically. Four months after the General Election, in September 11, 2001 United States was stricken by an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) attack towards its World Trade Center, believed launched by Al Qaeda under Osama Bin Laden. Because of that event, UK and United States became a strong alliance and were the frontguard in combatting such organizations. In the following years, UK was also carrying United Nations Security Council resolution mandate operation in order to disarming the Weapons of Mass Destruction alleged possessed by Iraqi government\textsuperscript{69}.

Receiving many critics and rejection from public upon its decision to go to Iraq war assisting the US operation in 2003, Blair historically won 2005 General Election, three consecutive winnings defeating the Conservative since 1997. That was another history that Blair wrote during his leadership in Labour party. The candidacy for his third election was already announced in October 2004 but he also stated that he would not go for the fourth term.

However, Blair’s popularity was generally decreasing after the election, both from public and the Labour MPs. Several sectors could not run well, such as the increasing level of violent crime, drug dealing, and even education sectors seem could not effectively working due to the social crisis and struggle to meet bureaucratic targets. Due to the bombing in 5 July, 2005, Blair and the government removed the ethnic culture policy, which separate different ethnic groups into different communities\textsuperscript{70}.

\textsuperscript{69} The operation met a dead-end as what alleged by the Western countries towards Iraq in WMDs possession issue was not proven
In November 2005, Labour was defeated by having 49 of its MPs come with the opposition—the Conservative—in refusing anti-terrorism law in the House of Commons. Many Labour MPs demanded Blair’s promise to step down from his premiership before the forthcoming election. In response to that, in September 2006 Blair stated that he would leave the office within a year. About a week after Labour’s loss in several local elections in England, Blair officially stated that he would leave the office in June 27, 2007.

II.2 Tony Blair’s Threat Perception and Defence Policy

As this research is trying to compare defence policy between two former UK Prime Ministers, this sub-chapter will try to analyze the linkage between Tony Blair’s threat perception and his defence policy. In order to establish a good analysis, author has chosen two factors that might shape Blair’s perception for his policy, those are the event of 9/11 attack in United States which briefly mentioned previously that marked a more strengthened security relations between UK and United States. The second factor is the relations between British government with two prominent regional organizations, EU and NATO will also be utilized to analyze this chapter.

First of all, threat perception is playing an important role in assessing leader’s defence policy. Threat perception in this research is acting as the intervening variable between the idiosyncrasy of the leaders and leaders’ defence policy output. Blair was definitely had some perceptions in his mind before he decided the policy for defence and security sectors. Those perceptions then lead Blair in formulating his defence policy for UK.

House of Commons library has published its statement upon the implications of 9/11 Blair’s defence policy,

“British defence policy has altered significantly since the Labour Government came to power in 1997. Those changes have been prompted largely by the shifting nature of strategic environment over that period, and in particular the events of 11 September 2001.”

Afterwards, UK connection with other actors in international relations, such as building alliance with other states in other region, EU and NATO has been highlighted in British government’s attention in forming its defence policy. The Ministry of Defence once stated in the 1997-1998 Security and Defence Review:

“Our security is indivisible from that of our European partners and Allies. We therefore have a fundamental interest in the security and stability of the continent as a whole and the effectiveness of NATO as a collective political and military instrument to underpin these interests.”\(^{72}\)

II.2.1 US-UK Defence and Security Relations

United States and UK could be regarded as two major powers in international relations. Its close relationship was marked ever since the wars among nations were still occured. Relations between the two powers has unofficially called as “Special Relationship” by the American and British analysts, politicians, and so on. The term Special Relationship has often been used to described the two closeness and high degree of mutual trust in cooperating in diplomatic, political, intelligence-sharing arrangements, and unique cooperation in nuclear and defence matters\(^{73}\).

US-UK relations or oftenly mentioned Anglo-American relations has been marked from the closeness of its leaders from time to time, such as President Roosevelt with Prime Minister Churchill, President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher, and lastly President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair. Besides the closeness of its leaders, the close relations was also seen from several engagement in international affairs which invoked the two states, starting from World War I, World War II, Gulf War, and Kosovo War\(^{74}\).

One of the foremost milestone of both’s defence and security relations in the 21\(^{st}\) century was the engagement of the two countries in military intervention towards several countries in the Middle East region. Further analysis will be


\(^{74}\) Ibid.
discussing the 9/11 attack as the omen of Anglo-American defence and security relations as well as its impacts towards UK defence policy under Tony Blair.

II.2.1.1 9/11 Implications on Tony Blair’s Defence Policy

In September 11, 2001, Blair was scheduled to address his speech for Trades Union Congress (TUC) Conference in Grand Hotel, Brighton. By the time he switch the television on, the channel was presenting a news when Boeing 737 passenger airlines struck the North Tower of World Trade Center and in the subsequent minutes, the South Tower was also hit by another hijacked plane. This attack was not only shook United States, but its other allies in other region as well, including UK.

In regards to that event, Blair cancelled his scheduled speech and delivered his sympathy towards all Americans instead and definitely condemn the attack. Everyone knew that United States would not stand still upon this attack, and its response will likely have effects cross boundaries. In Blair thought, whatever United States tried to respond to the attack, British government should back its decision. Blair addressed his sympathy in the forum:

“\textit{This mass terrorism is the new evil in our world today. It is perpetrated by fanatics who are utterly indifferent to the sanctity of human life and we, the democracies of this world, are going to have to come together to fight it together and eradicate this evil completely from our world.}”

Due to the attack, Blair saw the opportunity that this occasion will be an effective way for UK to strengthen its ties with the US. He also perceived that Britain could shape the exercise of American power and will become the bridging-tie between the US and Europe.

Following up the policy taken by Bush administration to respond the attack, Blair – in fact received many contradictions from colleagues and public upon his decision- decided to join what the US does. Foreign policy of “Global War on Terrorism” that established by Bush, means that the US government together

\footnote{TUC is a national trade union centre, basically a federation of trade unions in England and Wales which representing the majority of trade unions in Britain.}

with other powers in international politics will take any necessary means to combat what perceived as terrorism actions cross the world. 9/11 then regarded as a pivotal event that shape the contemporary international relations.

As the realization of its pretension to support US’ Global War on Terrorism policy, UK itself began to deploy its military forces to Afghanistan starting from November 2001\(^77\). According to Joint Doctrine and Concepts Centre in its publication, the US-declared ‘Global War on Terrorism’ and ongoing military transformation programme that significantly alter future United States concepts, diplomacy and global military footprint is one of the trends that would shape UK’s defence policy until 2030\(^78\). All of the military operations deployed to Afghanistan was called “Operation Herrick” which officially ended in 2014\(^79\).

**Operation Herrick**

Operation Herrick was seen as one of the implications of 9/11 attack towards UK defence policy. This military operation was launched under Blair government, six months after his second term of premiership took effects.

Operation Herrick was launched by British government firstly under US-led Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF)\(^80\) and continued under NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF)\(^81\).

This operation has the objectives to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven for such extremist organizations, and to build security

---


\(^{79}\) Operation Herrick was a military deployment that was held by UK under Tony Blair, continued in Gordon Brown and David Cameron premiership. However, the discussion of Operation will be limited until 2007, when the premiership of Tony Blair ended.

\(^{80}\) United States’ Operation Enduring Freedom began in on October 7, 2001 when George W. Bush announced that US and British government have sent airstrikes targeting Taliban and Al Qaeda in Afghanistan.

\(^{81}\) NATO International Security Assistance Force was started in August 11, 2003. Mandated by United Nations, ISAF’s primary objective was to enable the Afghan government to provide effective security forces to ensure Afghanistan would never again become a safe haven for extremist organizations.
and government institutions so that the progress of recent years becomes irreversible. Afghanistan under the government of Taliban assumed by the US was providing a protection shelter for Al Qaeda to grow and to develop. UK in this military operation aimed to bring about a stable, secure and self-sustainable Afghanistan with a democratic government that can maintain the rule of law, with a sustainable security environment where the population is free from coercion, a viable legitimate market economy that is increasingly able to support basic social needs.

UK military force that consist of Royal Air Force (RAF), Royal Army, and Royal Navy were mostly deployed to Helmand province in the Southern Afghanistan. In addition, Royal Forces were also deployed to Kandahar and Afghanistan’s capital, Kabul. In December, 2001, Taliban was able to be toppled from its last stronghold. Knowing this report, Blair hailed that as a victory by saying “a total vindication of the strategy we have worked out from the beginning”.

However, by taking 13 years of military deployment, Operation Herrick absorbed pretty much of defence budget and capabilities or resources of the government. Operation Herrick was also regarded as the biggest UK’s international military intervention.

---


83 Ibid.
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*Source: [www.amazon.co.uk/Wars-Peace-British-Military-Operations/dp/0855161930](http://www.amazon.co.uk/Wars-Peace-British-Military-Operations/dp/0855161930)*

During Blair premiership which was the initiation of the operation, the military cost was lower than two other Prime Ministers. Recorded from its first launching in 2001 until the end of Blair’s premiership in 2007, the total average net cost of military operations deployed to Afghanistan only was £851.2 m.

### II.2.2 NATO and EU Security Relations with UK under Tony Blair

UK is prominent with its influence in the surrounding regions. Located within two regional organization areas, Europe and North Atlantic, has allowed UK to exercise its hegemony there. Joining the membership in EU and NATO has the meaning that UK has different approach in building its relations with both of the organizations as the organizations were established under different objectives.

Blair also has stated his stance in terms of UK’s relations with its allies in general, in the speech at Lord Mayor’s Banquet:

> “The goal of our foreign policy is clear. We cannot in these post-Empire days be a superpower in the military sense. But we can make the British presence in the world felt. With historic alliances, we can be pivotal. We can be powerful in our influence – a nation to whom others listen.”

**II.2.2.1 NATO**

UK was one of the initiator states in the establishment of NATO, along with Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherland,

---
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Norway, Portugal United States in April 4, 1949 with the signing of Washington Treaty\textsuperscript{86}. This organization was in fact established for three purposes: deterring Soviet expansionism, forbidding the revival of nationalist militarism in Europe through a strong North American presence on the continent, and encouraging European political integration\textsuperscript{87}. In short, NATO’s activities are ranging from political and military relations among its member states.

In Blair’s early premiership, his government addressed the importance of NATO for British interests in its 1997/98 Strategic Defence Review:

"NATO remains the foundation of Europe’s and our own security. The Government will therefore seek to ensure the Alliance maintain its credibility and effectiveness by adapting to new strategic circumstances."\textsuperscript{88}

When Labour took the office, Blair was so eager in reforming NATO into a more modern, relevant, and capable organization in addressing various types and range of challenges in the modern era\textsuperscript{89}. When it comes to the discussion of NATO and UK, the two relations will cannot be separated from both’s commitment in military operations to Afghanistan. The deployment of International Security Assistance Force by NATO towards Afghanistan was arguably one of the most important development of NATO during the tenure of Blair\textsuperscript{90}.

\textbf{II.2.2.2 European Union}

UK relations with European Union (EU) could be traced into its early membership in the organization. The establishment of EU which previously known as European Coal and Steel Community and European Economic

\textsuperscript{86} Nato Established. (n.d.). Retrieved from History: http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/nato-established

\textsuperscript{87} NATO History. (n.d.). Retrieved from NATO: http://www.nato.int/history/nato-history.html


\textsuperscript{90} Ibid, p. 29
Community\textsuperscript{91} began in 1951, where the six initiator states, Belgium, France, West Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, and Luxembourg attempted to invite UK to join the community. However, because of some reasons, UK declined the invitation. Due to some economic instabilities in the subsequent years, UK was afterwards applied to join the community in 1961. One of the historians, James Ellison explained out to BBC in 2014, that Europe has not just been a place of conflict for Britain over the centuries, yet it was also a place of diplomatic agreement, trade, co-operation and - through most of the second half of the 20th Century and the 21st - peace and stability and growth\textsuperscript{92}.

By finally entering European Union in 1973 which at that time the community was still named European Economic Community, UK shall obey the terms and rules applied in the community like the other prior member states did, such as the supranationalism of the Union, common agricultural policy and the budget\textsuperscript{93}.

European Union which solely established to foster economic development and trade of European countries in the post-Cold War era, is now growing in size due to the accession of other new member states and into a more complex-objectives organization, encompassing from economic, political, social, security, and defence sectors for its member states. As European Union is getting bigger in size and stronger in influence, most of the member states could make the best of European Union, including UK. By joining the Union, UK could strengthen its influence in the region, not only to European Union member states but also non-European Union member states.

Following several crises faced by European states in mitigating international issues, UK under Blair took the steps to foster the development of European

\textsuperscript{91} Wilkinson, M. (2014, April 1). \textit{What is The EU, Why Was It Created and When It Was Formed}. Retrieved from BBC: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/06/20/what-is-the-eu-why-was-it-created-and-when-was-it-formed/


\textsuperscript{93} (n.d.). Retrieved from King's College London: http://ukandeu.ac.uk/fact-figures/why-did-the-united-kingdom-not-join-the-european-union-when-it-started/
defence capacity within the framework of NATO. Labour party’s skepticism upon UK’s integration with Europe was slightly altered by Blair, as Wyn Rees explained that Blair was trying to envisage a more equitably balanced defence arrangement in which transatlantic structures are matched by more capable Europe ones.\(^94\)

UK security relations with EU under Blair was basically colored by his attempts to become the bridge between NATO—which mostly led under United States—and developing Europe’s military capabilities.\(^95\)

II.3 Chapter Summary

Tony Blair’s idiosyncratic factors have the implications towards his defence policy for UK. His Oxford-graduate experience as one of the barristers in Britain along with his family background have led the beginning of Blair’s in becoming a prominent politician in British history. His political career which has been started from his involvement in the local parliament, running for the shadow cabinet from opposition government were actually the milestones for his dukedom as the Prime Minister of UK.

During his second and third term as the Prime Minister, there happened one event that affect not only UK, but the international relations as well. 9/11 that took place four months after Labour party and his triumph in 2001 General Election has altered and shaped the direction of UK defence policy. This event also marked the enhanced defence and security relations between United States and UK. The overseas military deployment was launched as the effort of Blair’s government to counter what perceived as terrorism and extremism actions in order to support United States’ Global War on Terrorism foreign policy.

Not only that, another factor that should be taken into consideration is the relation that UK built with several other regional organization has at least affected how should Blair’s government react to international security affairs. EU and NATO were one of the prominent organizations that that become the arena for


Britain to exercise its influence as Britain was actively involved in shaping both organization’s common policy.
CHAPTER III

IDIOSYNCYRATIC FACTORS OF DAVID CAMERON IN THE IMPLEMENTATION UK DEFENCE POLICY (2010-2016)

David Cameron is another former UK Prime Minister that needed to be explained in this research in order to complement the comparison with the previous Prime Minister, Tony Blair. In order to find the answer of this research’s question, it is important to analyze the personal background or further will be mentioned as idiosyncratic factors of Cameron, which acting as the independent variable of this research.

Besides analyzing his idiosyncracies, the other factor that also necessary in the discussion of defence policy is the threat perception of the leader, which could be seen in the elaboration of a certain case occurred during the premiership of Cameron. As for this chapter, the case chosen is the Arab Spring which prominently coloured Cameron’s leadership in UK. The way Cameron’s government mitigate international security issues by cooperating with other actors is also another form of his defence policy. Therefore, United States, NATO and EU security relations with UK under Cameron will also be analyzed in this research, since the three actors are recognized as the longstanding close allies of UK.

III.1 David Cameron’s Profile

Cameron’s position has marked the opening gate of a new form of government in the history of Conservative dominance. Cameron was substituting Labour’s premiership in 2010 until mid 2016 after the Labour took four terms in the office. Cameron’s presence in British politics that indicated the alteration of UK party’s dominance, from Labour to Conservative, could also bring implications towards UK defence policy. There will be some factors behind him that might have affected his policy for the government under his tenure, be it his personality, ambition, his belief views, and so on. Those factors will be explained more by
seeing the idiosyncrasy of David Cameron himself and its relation with his policy in defence and security sector.

### III.1.1 Early Years

As the third of four children, David Cameron was born in London on 9 October, 1966 with his full name David William Donald Cameron. He grew up in Peasemore, Berkshire after spent his first three years in Kensington and Chelsea\(^96\). His father was a stockbroker named, Ian Cameron and his mother is Mary Mount who was a retired Justice for Peace for around 30 years.

Cameron’s father, Ian, married Mary in October 1962, who has a family that closely related with Britain’s old nobility. Through his mother bloodline, it makes Cameron’s family connected to the ‘Famous Talbot’\(^97\), that included a lord chancellor who was serving the administration during who believed as the First Prime Minister of UK, Robert Walpole\(^98\).

Cameron grew in Church-loyal family. When he was still a kid, he was usually brought into the Queen Anne rectory that close to the church. Ian Cameron was a church warden and Mary Cameron was actively involved in Church activities. Church life was central for Cameron’s family and shaping Cameron’s view. Cameron also then admitted that he is an Evangelical Christian.

As he was born in a wealthy and aristocratic family, Cameron’s education since his childhood was well-guaranteed. When he aged seven, Cameron was sent to one of the prominent preparatory schools, the Heatherdown Preparatory School, which also became the school of Prince Edward and Prince Andrew\(^99\).

---

96 One of the districts in West London
97 Famous Talbot was a distinct noble family in British history. It has the relations with John Talbot, the 1st Earl of Shrewsbury and 1st Earl of Waterford KG, who was a prominent military commander during the Hundred Years’ War in fourteenth century
99 Ibid.
His godfather, Ben Glazebrook once pointed out a statement about Cameron’s sophisticated childhood:

“We had this party with some of our godchildren and David's 15 or 16-year-old friends from Eton. They were all talking about getting their cricket colours. David was obviously very bored by this, and said: 'Do you know the Etoile restaurant in Soho, Ben?' He knew the menu by heart. 'The sole Monégasque is so delicious,' he said. The other boys' jaws were dropping. He was far, far more sophisticated than his contemporaries.” 100

Following the family tradition, he was then entering the Eton College in Berkshire at the age of 13 and finished his early education in 1984 101. Afterwards, he continued his study to Brasenose College in University of Oxford and graduated in 1988 with an honorable degree in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics (PPE). One of his tutors, at Oxford, Vernon Bogdanor regarded him as “one of the ablest students he has taught, whose political views were Moderate and Sensible Conservative”.

His friends during school and college days defined him as and average good humoured and mischievous student 102. When he was attending the Brasenose College, he joined a controversial ‘Bullingdon’ club, where wealth was pre-requisite and excess was the characteristics. Some analysts are then categorized him as a hardcore Conservative right-wing from his membership at that club 103.

However, before attending Oxford to take his PPE subject, he took a gap year and working for Sussex Conservative MP, Tim Rathbone. He also has the experience for working as a shipping agent in Hongkong for three months.
and then return to England by rail through Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, before his Oxford years.¹⁰⁴

Long before he involved in British politics, as mentioned previously, he was basically born Conservative. Within the Camerons, even there were 3 Conservative MPs before himself. His family tree is quite prominent in British politics as he is the descendant of UK King William IV (1765-1837), which makes him has blood relation with the royalty and in short he is the current Queen Elizabeth II's fifth cousin¹⁰⁵ and at the same time he is also Boris Johnson's eighth cousin. By seeing his family background and supported by his personality and personal views, it can be seen that Cameron naturally has the potential to be involved in British government.

### III.1.2 Political Background/Experiences

Cameron’s political experiences can be traced back to his early times after graduating from Oxford in 1988. As a freshman, he was able to secure a job at the Conservative Party Research Department (CPRD). His active political involvement can be mentioned began in this early career. He worked for the CPRD from 1988 until 1992.

In 1991, he actually closely worked with John Major, who was then the Prime Minister. By his hard-working and bright characters, John Major described him as an “extraordinarily able and bright young man” and commend his coolness and ability to work even under pressure. From here, Cameron was promoted and he was able to undertake another job as the Chancellor of Exchequer, Norman Lamont’s political adviser in 1992, since the Conservatives gain victory in the election. In the following year, he run

---


¹⁰⁵ David Cameron. (n.d.). Retrieved from History: http://www.history.co.uk/biographies/david-cameron


¹⁰⁷ Boris Johnson is UK’s current Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs under the administration of Theresa May. He is also a Conservative MP since 2015 for Uxbridge and South Ruisily constituency and a former Mayor of London.

¹⁰⁸ Conservative Party Research Department is a think tank for the rightist party.
for the same job for Michael Howard, who then become the Home Secretary, and primarily Cameron served as the media role for Howard.

From 1994 to 2001, he left politics and instead worked for a British media company, Carlton Communication as the Director of Corporate Affairs. Within this range of years, Cameron finally married Samantha Sheffield in 1996 who firstly met Cameron in 1993. Samantha’s stepfather, Viscount Astor had ministerial responsibility for broadcasting under the era of John Major, which then Cameron find helpful for his Public Relations career. He afterwards left the company in 2001 and attempted to run for parliamentary seat in Witney, in the Northwest of London.

Winning the parliamentary election and representing Oxfordshire in Witney district in 2001 was Cameron’s milestone into a higher stage of his career in British politics. Following his popularity within the Tory, he was trusted as Conservative’s spokesman for the House of Commons in 2003. In the subsequent year, Michael Howard, who at that time was the Prime Minister, appointed Cameron to serve as the Head of Policy Coordination and responsible in preparing Conservative’s manifesto for 2005 General Election\(^\text{109}\). Cameron also positioned as Shadow Education Secretary under Howard. Seeing the positive side, Conservative’s loss to Labour party during two consecutive General Elections in 2001 and 2005 seen as the opportunity for Cameron to rise within the party.

Conservative’s loss in 2005 General Election has led Michael Howard to resign from his position. Cameron’s speech during Conservative’s annual conference in October 2005 was found attractive by the other Conservatives. Cameron mentioned that he would emphasize on the revitalization of Conservative by aiming people to “feel good about being a Conservative again”, from his sayings, “I want to switch on a whole

new generation.\textsuperscript{110} In December 2005, he was finally declared as the new Conservative leader succeeding Howard.

During his early leadership in the party, he was able to bring the party to victory in several 2006 local elections\textsuperscript{111}. That was mentioned as the best of Conservatives performance in about 15 years. During Conservative’s annual conference in early October 2007, he again made an impressive no-script speech. In regards to the upcoming European Union summit in Lisbon, discussing a reform on treaty, Cameron criticized several of Gordon Brown’s\textsuperscript{112} decision and subsequently criticized Labour’s policy in general.

Gaining more popularity during his leadership in the party and assumed has given a lot of contribution to the party, such as brought Conservative to the top of poll in European Parliament elections in June 4, 2009 which made the entrance for the party to legislative body as the member of European Conservatives and Reformist Group\textsuperscript{113}.

In the midst of 2009, Labour party who run the government at that time, suffered a decreasing popularity in British politics. This has led Conservative in advantage for the upcoming 2010 General Election, which was planned to be held in May. By achieving 306 seats in the election, the highest total of the seats, Conservative was finally declared as the victor for 2010 election after defeated in four consecutive elections since 1997, since Tony Blair came to power.

\textbf{III.1.3 David Cameron’s Premiership (2010-2016)}

The victory of Conservative during the 2010 General Election has eventually appointed Cameron, who at that time was the leader of

\textsuperscript{110} David Cameron Biography. (n.d.). Retrieved from Biography: www.biography.com/people/david-cameron-39203


\textsuperscript{112} Gordon Brown was the Prime Minister for UK since 2007-2010, succeeding Tony Blair. Brown was backed by the Labour party.

Conservative party since 2005, as the new Prime Minister of UK, recorded as the youngest one after almost two centuries\textsuperscript{114}. Even though Conservative won the highest total of 306 seats during the election, it was lacking of 20 seats to reach the majority vote. This has the meaning that Conservative has to form a coalition to run the government for the next five years. Liberal-Democrat party was then chosen as the coalition government along with Conservative, with Nick Clegg appointed as the Deputy of Prime Minister.

That coalition was recognized as the first coalition government since the World War II\textsuperscript{115}. Cameron, quoted by \textit{The Telegraph}, stated about his cooperation with the Liberal Democrats as saying:

\begin{quote}
“We have some deep and pressing problems – a huge deficit, deep social problems, a political system need in a reform. For those reasons, I aim to form a proper and full coalition between the Conservative and the Liberal Democrats. I believe that it is the right way to provide this country a strong, the stable, the good, and the decent government that I think we need so badly.”\textsuperscript{116}
\end{quote}

The tenure of Cameron was basically started during economic and financial austerity hits the UK government. Upon this matter, the remedical issue will be focusing on economic sector in his early premiership. Beside economic and financial sectors, Cameron’s government in his early premiership was trying to reform many public services and mitigate social problems.

Five months after he came to power, in regards to defence and security, Cameron has mentioned in October 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review (SDSR) that his government will continue some inheritance from the previous governments, such as the military operation in Afghanistan or so called Operation Herrick. Cameron tried to ensure that the operation will be well-funded and equipped until the mission


\textsuperscript{115}David Cameron Biography. (n.d.). Retrieved from Biography: www.biography.com/people/david-cameron-39203

\textsuperscript{116}Ibid.
perceived successful by the government. In advance to this operation, Cameron’s government intended to reduce the defence capability –budget and Armed Forces capability- that assumed has burdened the government. Afterwards, since the operation was launched in 2001, Afghanistan’s President Karzai at that time stated that the Afghan National Security Forces will take lead and conduct military operation across Afghanistan by the end of 2014, which also marked the end of UK military intervention in Afghanistan\(^{117}\).

Despite those economic and social matters that attracted Cameron’s attention more in his early leadership in UK, there was one international phenomenon that seen as the prominent arena for Cameron to conduct the defence and security capability of UK. A revolution surrounding the Middle East and some Northern Africa region was held by the people, which then recognized as Arab Spring\(^{118}\). Many analysts and observers argued that the revolution was held by those pro-democracy mass movements. This was also believed as one of the reasons why the Western countries –who are the promoters of democracy- tried to take parts in this occasion, including UK.

To that extent, Cameron even committed a £110 million aid to support the uprisings in Middle East and North Africa. He also addressed his political view to the world leaders during the G8 Summit in France in 2011 as saying:

“I want a very simple and clear message to come out of this summit, and that is that the most powerful nations on earth have come together and are saying to those in the Middle East and North Africa who want greater democracy, greater freedom, greater civil rights, we are on your side.”\(^{119}\)

\(^{118}\) Arab Spring was a series of revolt held firstly in early 2011 by the people in some Middle East and Northern Africa region. The revolt was basically initiated from Tunisia, when mass protesters demanded their former President, Zine El Abidine Ben Ali to step down from the government. The act then spread throughout the countries in those two regions which have been led by what perceived a dictator, corrupt and unjust government, such as Egypt, Libya, Syria, Morocco, and Jordan.
\(^{119}\) Porter, A. (2011, May 27). Arab Spring will add to extremism if we do not help, says David Cameron. Retrieved from The Telegraph: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/david-
Cameron’s decision to take an active role in this intervention might have been affected by his political history and operational reality, when Conservative Party has also been active in foreign engagement, seen from Cameron’s predecessors; such as Harold MacMillan’s ‘Winds of Change’120, Margaret Thatcher’s involvement with Mikhael Gorbachev121, and John Major’s signing to Belfast agreement122.

By agreeing a five-years-fix-term for structural position in British politics during his early leadership, Cameron’s first term as a prime minister shall be ended in 2015. However, the 2015 General Election was held in May 7 and resulted on the victory of Conservative by gaining 331 majority seats123. This marked the beginning of Cameron’s second term in Downing Street124.

While he was serving as the premier, he has conducted three referendums for British people125. After issued for the first time in 2013, in June 23, 2016, UK has conducted a referendum upon the matter of its membership in European Union. The question given to the voters was “Should the UK remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?”126 The referendum falls to UK shall leave the European Union by winning the majority 52% of vote upon 48%127 with more than

---

120 It was a speech of him in regards to the independence of African nation and freedom from Apartheid system that was applied in Africa at that time
121 Thatcher and Gorbachev (former leader of Soviet Union in the late 1980s) has come to a mutual cooperation in against the reunification of Germany and a profound disagreement on nuclear abolition
122 Belfast agreement was included in a series of peace process between Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland. It was also an agreement on a reciprocal relations between the three countries; UK, Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland
124 Downing Street is usually mentioned in refer to the office of UK prime minister
125 Referendum on the matter of UK membership in EU in 2013 and 2016, and the Scottish independece referendum in 2014
30 million people voted. This referendum was then so influential for Cameron’s phase as a prime minister, as he is the supporter of UK membership in EU. He was then announcing on June 24 that he will be resigning from his position by the time of the Conservative conference in October, 2016.\(^\text{128}\)

### III.2 David Cameron’s Threat Perception and Defence Policy (2010-2016)

“This is vital at a time when the threats to our country are growing. From the rise of ISIL and greater instability in the Middle East, to the crisis in Ukraine, the threat of cyber attacks and the risk of pandemics, the world is more dangerous and uncertain today than five years ago. So while every government must choose how to spend the money it has available, every penny of which is hard-earned by taxpayers, this Government has taken a clear decision to invest in our security and safeguard our prosperity.”\(^\text{129}\)

By referring to the second chapter of this study and previously elaborated in first chapter’s theoretical framework, Cameron’s defence policy while he was serving as the prime minister must be affected by the way he perceived the threats posed to UK. Any actions taken by the leaders in general are most likely the realization of his or her threat perception.

The elements of threat perception between Tony Blair and David Cameron in this study will be the same, yet the case chosen will be different. As for Cameron, his early premiership was colored by an international phenomenon which then lead Cameron’s government to take actions. Arab Spring that happened in early 2011, less than a year after Cameron came to office, has affected Cameron’s decision in security and defence sectors and altered the conditions in several Muslim-populated world in Middle East and Northern African region.

In a report published by the Foreign Affairs Committee of House of Commons in 2012, Cameron government stated that:


\(^{129}\) Foreword of Cameron in 2015 National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review
“The wave of uprisings that swept across the Middle East and North Africa region at the start of 2011 and which came to be known as the Arab Spring continues to represent both the greatest challenge and the greatest opportunity to date for this Government’s foreign policy. It presented a practical, consular challenge to ensure the safety of tens of thousands of British nationals abroad; a diplomatic challenge as the Government sought to engage constructively with the old and new regimes; and a military challenge to protect civilians in Libya.”

Also, in order to construct a better analysis, the relations between UK and United States, EU as well as NATO under Cameron’s tenure will also be explained in this chapter. This was based on the argument of Cameron’s government that it has set three from five priorities in their 2010 SDSR for the international engagement which included the three prior actors (United States, EU, and NATO) in their defence policy. By explaining UK relations with those three actors, Cameron and his government’s perception of threats could be seen.

III.2.1 US-UK Defence and Security Relations under David Cameron (2010-2016)

As what have been mentioned previously that UK has what so called Special Relationship with United States since centuries ago, this close tie is also continued under Cameron’s tenure. By taking the same steps as his predecessors and United States’ former leaders, Cameron and Obama pledged will maintain the firm relations under their tenure, as reported by The Guardian.

Cameron’s government asserted the special relationship that UK and United States have built in its 2015 SDSR:

“The US is the leading global economic and defence power, and the world continues to look to it to shape global stability and to lead international responses to crises. The Prime Minister and the President of the United

States have recently reaffirmed the essential nature of our special relationship. The US is our pre-eminent partner for security, defence, foreign policy and prosperity. Our contribution to the special relationship includes our European and global reach and influence; intelligence; the strategic location of our Overseas Territories; as well as military interoperability, and the UK’s ability to undertake war-fighting independently or as a lead nation in a coalition.\textsuperscript{133}

The relation that these two nation-states has built is established mostly under the same values and interests as well. As two major powers, Cameron and Obama deemed necessary to conduct a better cooperation in terms of defence and security sectors. The occurrence of Arab Spring then, has also showed the pattern of UK and United States cooperation in preserving both’ security and attaining their common interests.

However, similar with other usual states-relation, the Special Relationship between United States and UK was not always a tranquil one. There were times when both states’ leaders experienced a strain towards each others’ decision, such as in terms of Libyan intervention in the wake of Arab Spring in 2011, which Obama did not really encourage some of Cameron’s decision to the intervention. His reason was due to he will be facing a re-election campaign in the subsequent year, in which he did not want to confront the risk for his decision that mark United States’ third military invasion towards Muslim world, after Iraq and Afghanistan previously\textsuperscript{134}.

III.2.1.1 Arab Spring Implications on David Cameron’s Defence Policy

Arab Spring or so called Arab uprisings took place between December 2010 and December 2011, within several countries in Middle East and Northern African region. This event in the end was invoking

\textsuperscript{133} Foreword of Cameron in 2015 National Security Strategy and Strategic Defence and Security Review

of 22 nation-states registered as the members in Arab League. This phenomenon which emerged not long after Cameron came to office in October 2010, has significantly invited British government under him to deliver various of responses, ranging from consular challenge, diplomatic efforts, and up to military intervention.

Cameron addressed the G8 world leaders summit in May 2011 held in France, as the response to the occurrence of Arab Spring, that it was an opportunity and concurrently a possible threats towards not only Britain, yet other countries as well:

“There is a real case for saying if you can secure greater democracy and freedom in countries like Egypt and Tunisia, that is good for us back at home. That will mean less extremism, it will mean more peace and prosperity, it will mean there will not be the pressure on immigration that many otherwise face our country.”

The rationales behind the uprisings were comprising of economic and social reasons, which further touched the political matter. Some of the economic problems faced by the countries that held the revolution were unemployment, poverty, widening inequality, and rising food prices. These economic problems were concluded by British analysts as the main driving factors of the revolution in the region.

The uprisings was basically begun from Tunisia in December 2010, when a street vendor resented his disappointment of state officials for confiscated his property and humiliated him. The protests spread

---

135 The 18 countries were Qatar, United Arab Emirate, Lebanon, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Oman, Kuwait, Jordan, Morocco, Algeria, Bahrain, Sudan, Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Yemen, and Syria
throughout the country, which in the end resulted in the resignation of Zine el Abidine Ben Ali, the President who ruled Tunisia since 1987\textsuperscript{140}. What happened in Tunisia has triggered its neighboring countries, which seem confronting similar problems, to held the same revolution, including Egypt, Libya, Syria, Bahrain, Mali, Jordan, Morocco, and so on. However, it is important to know that not all of the uprisings were resulted in political restructured. Philip Leech and Jamie Gaskarth (2015) have categorized the uprisings based on the severity of the protests and the response from each government\textsuperscript{141}.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
No Significant Protests & Some Protests; No Significant Government Concessions & Some Protests; Some Government Concessions & Significant Protests; Some Government Concessions & Significant Protests; Limited Government Concessions & Significant Rupture in the Structure of Rule \\
\hline
Qatar & Lebanon & Iraq & Jordan & Algeria & Egypt \\
UAE & Palestine & Oman & Morocco & Bahrain & Libya \\
 & Saudi Arabia & Kuwait & Sudan & Tunisia & Syria \\
 & & & & & Yemen \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Overview of Severity of Protests and Government Response}
\end{table}

\textit{Figure III.1 The categorization of Severity of Protests and Government Response during the Arab Spring}

By seeing the figure above, author will only be focusing on the country with significant rupture on structural rule, that is Libya. Thus, as the representatives of Western world, UK and United States cooperated in providing supports to those pro-democracy protesters behind the reasons of the conduct of ‘Humanitarian Intervention’\textsuperscript{142} and spreading Western values, namely democracy and freedom. Their actions were then lead other actors to take part in the intervention during Arab Spring uprisings, especially in Libya, which including NATO, United Nations, France, and other Western allies.

\textsuperscript{140} \textit{Ibid.} p. 16
\textsuperscript{142} \textit{Arab Spring: Revolutions, Lies, and Intervention}. (2011, August 31). Retrieved from Global Research: Arab Spring: Revolution, Lies and Intervention http://www.globalresearch.ca/arab-spring-revolutions-lies-and-intervention/26302
Operation Ellamy

Following the uprisings in Tunisia and Egypt, the mass protesters in Libya began to assemble in 15 February 2011. The uprising was then analyzed triggered by the arrest of Fathi Terbil, a prominent Libyan lawyer and a campaigner by Libyan officials. However, what happened in Libya was quite different from the two former states, in which the revolution was held peacefully in Tunisia and Egypt, yet it turned out violent in Libya since the opposition protesters earned arms and strive against the government military\textsuperscript{143}. All of military operation by UK government towards Libyan uprisings issue was conducted under the codename of Operation Ellamy.

Libyan uprisings has taken UK’s attention more than other countries and deemed necessary to intervene, in order to protect British and foreign nationals in Libya\textsuperscript{144}. Nonetheless, seeing this only reason was not strong enough for UK and even other Western powers to deploy their troops there. Besides the social reasons, other rationals that have invited Cameron and his allies were more to political and economic matters. Libyan leader, Colonel Muammar Gaddafi who has been ruling since 1969, was recognized as a not close-partner to the Western powers which then ‘displeased’ them\textsuperscript{145}. In terms of economic matter, before the revolution emerged, Col. Gaddafi was prior invited some of African and Middle Eastern countries to adopt a single currency to purchase goods and for other transactions, that is the Gold Dinar. This Col. Gaddafi’s invitation was seen could endanger the economies of Western nations\textsuperscript{146}. Also, another economic rational behind the intervention of Western countries was that Libya is known as the largest oil and gas reserver in

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{146} Ibid.
African region which definitely called lots of Western oil companies to have access to it\textsuperscript{147}.

The crisis was escalated as in the end of February 2011, the opposition protesters established National Transitional Council (NTC) in Benghazi to conduct the revolution throughout the country. Due to this, UK government invited the Arab League to urge United Nations Security Council (UNSC) to pass 1970 resolution and give access to go against the Gaddafi’s regime\textsuperscript{148}. Under the authorization of United Nations as well, the No-Fly zone was established in 17 March 2011 over Libyan air territory and urged ‘any necessary measure’ to protect the civilians, including travel ban, arms embargo to Gaddafi’s military, and freezing Gaddafi’s family assets\textsuperscript{149}.

By carrying UNSC Resolution 1973 mandate, British Armed Forces along with United States and France began airstrikes towards Gaddafi supporter forces, especially to Libyan Air Defence systems in 19 March until NATO took control in 31 March. Reportedly, British aircraft has conducted 3000 missions, in which 2000 of them were sorties. The MoD also stated that the Royal Air Force has succesfully hit 640 military targets in Libya\textsuperscript{150}.

The anti-Gaddafi protesters took control of Tripoli, capital of Libya in August and urged the longstanding President to hide. After being besieged by the protesters since September, Gaddafi was killed in 20 October 2011. Thus, the NTC then declared that Libya was independent and pledged to conduct the elections within eight months\textsuperscript{151}. Foreign and

\textsuperscript{147} How has military intervention in Libya shaped the Arab Spring? (2011, April 5). Retrieved from The Transnational Institute: https://www.tni.org/en/article/how-has-military-intervention-libya-shaped-arab-spring


\textsuperscript{149} Ibid, p.16


Commonwealth Office (FCO) of UK stated that its government under Cameron’s lead has played a key role in shaping international response towards Libyan uprisings.

**Defence Expenditure**

Operation Ellamy or the overall operations conducted during the Libyan uprisings by the Royal Armed Forces was recognized by British analysts as Cameron’s ‘first war’ since he took the office in 2010. The military intervention was firstly held under his leadership, unlike operations in Afghanistan and Iraq which firstly conducted by his predecessors\(^{152}\).

As his first war, he has allocated a quite high budget only for the Operation Ellamy. According to MoD Annual Reports, it counted that the Net Additional Cost of the operations was £21.6 million as per 31 March 2011, just around a month after the operation was launched. However, as the operation was concluded in 31 October 2012, the MoD announced the net additional cost was £300 million. This amount constituted £160 million of operating costs and £140 million of the cost of replenishing munitions\(^{153}\).

**III.2.2 NATO and EU Security Relations with UK under David Cameron**

By trying to continue what his predecessors did, Cameron also attempted to maintain a good relation between Britain and prominent regional integrations, such as NATO and EU, in order to advance its national interests and security. As what have been mentioned previously, Cameron has emphasized in his 2010 SDSR, that his government will

\(^{152}\) *David Cameron Libyan War Analysis: Why The PM Felt Gaddafi Had to be Stopped.* (2011, October 2). Retrieved from The Guardian: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/oct/02/david-cameron-libyan-war-analysis

continue a more enhanced bilateral relations with international organizations, more specifically NATO and EU.

Becoming the active member of both organization, UK has proved that its influence is so essential for the other member countries, as UK also has power due to its permanent membership in United Nations Security Council. By joining both alliances, UK and other member countries could enjoy a reciprocal mutual benefits, Britain will still be able to maintain its major influence in the region and other members could also be benefitted from British’s supports for their political and security necessities.

As Cameron’s government deemed the cooperation between NATO, EU, and UK as complementary important, it was also inserted in UK’s 2015 SDSR:

“Through its 28 member states and EU institutions, the EU has a range of capabilities to build security and respond to threats, which can be complementary to those of NATO. These include sanctions, missions (military and civilian), and security and development support worldwide. We will also continue to foster closer coordination and cooperation between the EU and other institutions, principally NATO, in ways which support our national priorities and build Euro-Atlantic security. This will include areas such as cyber and countering hybrid threats, and work to develop security capacity in other states.

Under Cameron leadership, he aims to foster a better defence and security cooperation between his government and the two alliances. He also intended to work on a closer coordination built between NATO and EU, in order to support Britain’s national priorities and to establish Euro-Atlantic security.

III.2.2.1 NATO

When it comes to the discussion of security relations built by British government and NATO under Cameron’s leadership, it is also not really far from the discussion of nuclear issues. British’s nuclear deterrent program has been supported the collective security throught NATO for the Euro-Atlantic region. As one of the major contributor to the security of the
members, beside United States, UK also considered to use its nuclear weapons to protect the NATO allies when necessary.\(^{154}\)

Cameron’s government stated the importance of managing a firm relations with NATO in its 2010 SDSR:

“\textit{The UK is a founding member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), which has been the bedrock of our defence for over 60 years. Our obligations to our NATO Allies will continue to be among our highest priorities and we will continue to contribute to NATO’s operations and its Command and Force Structures, to ensure that the Alliance is able to deliver a robust and credible response to existing and new security challenges. Key to NATO’s future will be the agreement and implementation of its new Strategic Concept which will set out its enduring purpose, its fundamental security tasks and guidance to Allies.}”

Cameron also strived to meet NATO target of defence budget during his premiership. This effort showed how Cameron perceives that a robust security relations between the two ties remains importance for both sides. In his second term of premiership, Cameron added that what his government has been doing for the last five years, has brought UK as the only major country that is going to simultaneously spend 2\% of the GDP to meet NATO target\(^{155}\).

“\textit{Nevertheless, because of the priority we are placing on our national security, defence and security budgets will contribute to deficit reduction on a lower scale than some other departments. The defence budget will rise in cash terms. It will meet the NATO 2\% target throughout the next four years. We expect to continue with the fourth largest military budget in the world.}”\(^{156}\)

The interventions that UK has engaged with NATO in several cases under Cameron’s government only, such as military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, peacekeeping operation in the Balkans and Cyprus,


\(^{156}\) David Cameron’s foreword noted in 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review
and the intervention in Libya to oust Gaddafi from power\textsuperscript{157} were the evidences that the two ties were still committed in similar security interests across the world.

\textbf{III.2.2.2 European Union}

As Cameron was backed by the Conservative party or one of the right wing parties in British politics, which promoted equity for the people, Cameron’s stance on the EU was to keep his government as a good ally to the union. As what has been mentioned previously, that the EU is now growing in size and influence which marked by the establishment of Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP) for its member countries, Cameron was eager to make the best of EU for British’s security and prosperity.

David Lidington, one of the Conservative MPs under Cameron’s government addressed a speech in 2012 that articulated the importance of EU in preserving security for UK and other member countries in general:

“\textit{the EU has its own unique selling points when it comes to international security. Its advantage lies in the broad and complementary tools it can use - diplomatic, civilian, military, developmental, and financial - which it can apply collectively to promote international peace, often in places where NATO and others cannot act.}”\textsuperscript{158}

Reaching the end of his first term leadership, an issue of the establishment of “EU army” or so called integrated EU military was widely spread amongst the member countries of the union. However, the British government through its Conservative MP, Tom Pursglove stated that, “\textit{The British people have no desire for an EU army. We are immensely proud of}


our Armed Forces and owe all those who serve an enormous debt of gratitude."  

Beside a vibrant security relationship between EU and UK, some of the Britishs are favoured of its country to leave the union. Those who are Eurosceptic argued that the only reason for the country to stay in the union is just financial matter. Those Eurosceptics also argued that the EU has swerved from the ideals of its early establishment in the midst 1990s. Due to this, the referendum on whether UK shall remain in the union or not was held in 2016, as promised by Cameron if he was re-elected in 2015. Unfortunately, the Eurosceptics have won their pretension which resulted to the end of Cameron’s career as the Prime Minister, who was so eager in keeping UK to stay in the EU.

III.3 Chapter Summary

By having the opportunity to rule UK for six years, David Cameron also has the privileges to decide the defence policy for his country. Cameron who is originating from a wealthy and aristocrat family, has enjoyed a privileged life until he can graduate from Oxford in Philosophy, Political, and Economy degree. This also marked the beginning of young Cameron in British politics, who also backed by the Conservative party, one of the oldest parties in British political system.

Experienced as a Conservative Spokesman to the House of Commons, Head of Policy Coordination under Howard premiership, Shadow Education Minster and Member of Parliament did not stop Cameron’s step to pursue a higher political position. After becoming the leader of Conservative party since 2005, Cameron could secure the office as the Prime Minister impli-tly from May 2010. However, less than a year after Cameron came to office, Arab Sprin swept some of the Middle Eastern and Northern African countries. This was found as a threat by Cameron
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which then lead his government to launch military intervention to the conflicting areas, such as Libya.

Despite the military interventions done by British government, the relations between UK and other allies is also significant in showing the defence policy under Cameron leadership. UK along with United States, NATO, and EU have witnessed a strong defence and security cooperation in tackling threats posed to the alliance. Lots of defence and security arrangement that invoked the four actors was held several times under Cameron’s tenure, which also proved their commitments to foster security and mitigating what perceived as common threats.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF IDIOSYNCRATIC FACTORS OF TONY BLAIR (2001-2007) AND DAVID CAMERON (2010-2016) IN UK DEFENCE POLICY

As the former UK prime ministers, Tony Blair who governed the office since 1997-2007 and David Cameron since 2010-2016 have significantly contributed defence policy in order to protect the national interests and national security of UK. This research that aims to find the differences and similarities of both’ premiers defence policy during their government, have explored the personal background, political background, educational background, the premiership of both which then concluded in the idiosyncratic factors of the prime ministers, and also explored the relation between the threat perception of both leaders’ implication towards their defence policy.

After the explanation provided in the previous three chapters, this very chapter of the research will try to analyze the relation of the independent variable and the dependent variable. The independent variable of this research is the idiosyncratic factors of the leaders and its dependent variable is the defence policy decided by the leaders. By analyzing these two variables, the differences and similarities of Blair and Cameron’s defence policy in the range of period of 2001-2007 for Blair tenure and from 2010-2016 of Cameron’s tenure can be explored. This chapter will also see the aspects of the different and similar defence policy, in order to sharpen the analysis of the defence policy that have been applied by Blair and Cameron.

IV.1 The Correlation of Idiosyncratic Factors with Defence Policy Outcome

By referring to the concept proposed by Laura R. Cleary, the Security Policy in general are included: Political-military relations with neighbours and others; Policy towards regional organization and the United Nations; Intelligence priorities and collection; Arms control, non proliferation, and treaty regimes; and
Peacekeeping and participation in multinational operations\textsuperscript{162}, the defence policy that have been applied by Blair and Cameron in the range of year 2001-2007 and 2010-2016 are also classified from one or more categories proposed by Laura.

From the analysis in the previous chapters, concerned with each prime minister’s case, most of the defence policy that decided by Blair and Cameron were included in three from five Security Policy elements by Laura, namely the political-military relations with neighbours and other countries; policy towards regional organization; and peacekeeping and participation in multinational operations.

Also, as this chapter’s objective is to answer the research question, it is definitely important to analyze the independent variable of this research, that is the idiosyncratic factors of the leaders and its dependent variable, which is the defence policy.

Looking back to the explanation of idiosyncratic factors, that is the study of humans as individuals and how each leader’s personal characteristics help shape his or her decisions, Byman and Pollack added that the idiosyncracy of a leader affects the states in the way his or her goals, abilities, and foibles are crucial to the intentions, capabilities, and strategies of a state (Byman & Pollack, 2011:111)\textsuperscript{163}.

Therefore, from that short definition of idiosyncratic factors, it is clearly seen that the policy decided by the leaders, be it the foreign or defence policy, can be analyzed by seeing the idiosyncrasies of the leaders, which could take form either his or her personality; physical and mental health; ego and ambition; political history and experience; or perceptions and operational reality\textsuperscript{164}. Those factors will create certain values that might affect the defence policy decided by the leaders.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid, p.74
IV.1.1 Influence of Idiosyncratic Factors of Tony Blair and David Cameron in the Defence Policy

Tony Blair and David Cameron were recognized as British prime ministers in the beginning of 21st century. The ups and downs in British politics have shaped these two figures from ordinary men into prominent politicians who then able to secure the Prime Minister office in Downing Street 10.

Throughout their tenure, there are definitely certain policies that have been taken by them. Both’s political background and experience which have been built since the two figures were not popular in British politics, also contributed to the policies decided by them with the intention to protect the national interests and security of UK. These two premiers were backed by two different yet major political parties in British parliamentary system, Blair by the Labour and Cameron by the Conservative.

Both of the former British prime ministers, Blair and Cameron have experienced significant events during the leadership which then affected the position of UK stance in international politics. Blair has led UK for three periods, starting from 1997 until 2007, while Cameron has led UK for 6 years since 2010 to 2016.

In the beginning of Blair’s second term of premiership, the 9/11 attack was addressed towards US whose known as the closest Western ally of UK. This has marked the new era of US’ foreign policy which at that time led by George W. Bush and even international relations in general.

As a close ally, Blair deem necessary to help and support his partner’s decision in order to mitigate what they perceived as terrorism which also could harm the security of UK. Due to this perception, Blair decided to assist and actively involved in the military operations held under US command to Afghanistan in 2001. All military operations deployed by UK towards Afghanistan was called Operation Herrick, that intended to
protect Afghanistan from being another safe haven for such extremist group, like Al Qaeda and to create a more democratic government for Afghan people.

Operation Herrick was one of the forms of Blair’s defence policy during his tenure. Due to the overseas military operations that took place under his leadership, Blair’s policy was regarded as an interventionist policy. This decision of Blair to deploy BAF to Afghanistan –and other overseas military operations- might be influenced by his belief which was shaped since his study at college.

According to the concept compiled from John T. Rourke & Mark A. Boyer and Joshua S. Goldstein & Jon C. Pevehouse (figure I.2), value and belief are also involved in the element of individual decision maker. This has the meaning that policies decided by leader can be influenced by his or her belief. As mentioned by Seldon, “He [Blair] conceptualises the world as a struggle between good and evil in which his particular vocation is to advance the former.” (Seldon, 2005: 700). From that belief, it does make sense when Blair decided to fight Islamic extremist group as he saw the group posed a potential terrorism threat towards the security of UK and the world in general.

Afterwards, the leadership of Cameron in UK was began in 2010. His early premiership was also marked with the emergence of Arab Spring in several Middle Eastern and Northern African countries. This Arab Spring emerged after Cameron came to power for six months. Mostly, the people who held the revolution during Arab Spring were demanding the leader of the country to step down from the position.

Since the uprisings rapidly spreaded, the peaceful revolution turned into the violent one in several countries, one of them was Libya. Libya in 2011 was still under the presidency of Muammar Al Gaddafi, which was known as a dictator by the Western powers, including UK. The existence of Gaddafi who has ruled Libya for decades, who has applied strict policies
towards Libyan people, and seen threaten the economy of Western powers have triggered UK to take actions in order to protect the national interests, security for British people in Libya and Libyan people in general.

By that reason, UK with the approval of Cameron, also backed by US and other Western powers, began military operation towards Libya to conduct a humanitarian intervention. The operation was basically started in February 2011. UK military operation towards Libya was held under the codename of Operation Ellamy.

The conduct of humanitarian intervention as the justification of military intervention by one or several states within the territory of another sovereign state, believed as common in international politics as it is an old concept\textsuperscript{165}. Even though the operation was conducted behind the reason of humanitarian intervention, one of the other agendas of UK was to oust Gaddafi from power. By ousting Gaddafi from Libya, UK will be much easier in controlling Libya and able to spread Western values, such as democracy and freedom.

In contrast with Blair, Cameron tried to apart himself from the approach of liberal interventionism, which attached to Blair’s policy. However, by seeing his decision to deploy military forces to Libya, Cameron indirectly showed his ‘passionate interventionist’ side\textsuperscript{166}. Therefore, in relation with idiosyncratic factors, the factor that might have shaped Cameron’s policy is more to perception.

As what have been stated by Rourke, perceptions play an important key role in policy because they form an operational reality, which has the meaning that policy makers –leaders- are inclined to act based on their


\textsuperscript{166} \textit{David Cameron Libyan War Analysis: Why The PM Felt Gaddafi Had to be Stopped}. (2011, October 2). Retrieved from The Guardian: https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/oct/02/david-cameron-libyan-war-analysis
perception, whether they are accurate or not\textsuperscript{167}. Cameron stated in regards to Gaddafi, “\textit{But our view is clear, there is no decent future for Libya with Colonel Gaddafi remaining in power.}”\textsuperscript{168} In this case, Cameron perceived that Gaddafi’s dictatorship was a threat to the security of the people in Libya and Western powers, which then drive him to oust Gaddafi at the moment of Arab Spring emergence.

Also, both prime ministers’ commitment to actively involve in the safeguard of international security issues also seen from the engagement of UK with EU and NATO as the prominent regional organization in Euro-Atlantic area. Besides exercising its influence in both organizations, UK has also proved that a cooperation with the two organizations to tackle security threat was a good decision. Basically, the way Blair and Cameron treated the two organizations were quite similar. This can be seen as both of the prime ministers have put EU and NATO in their defence policy structure.

Under Blair tenure, especially post 9/11, one of the foremost security relations between UK and NATO was the involvement of both actors in the military operations towards Afghanistan, began in 2003, which deployed under NATO-led through ISAF. This was seen by many analysts that UK under Blair was still trying to maintain a good relations with NATO. Meanwhile for EU, Blair’s premiership was mainly filled by the effort of British government to harmonize EU military capability within the framework of NATO\textsuperscript{169}. Having a good relationship with United States, Blair deem important for UK to be the bridge between EU and NATO relations and concurrently tried to strengthen European’s military capabilities to cope the challenges posed to its member countries\textsuperscript{170}. For

\textsuperscript{170} Ibid, p.32
Blair’s decision to enhance security relations with regional organizations, it can be driven by one of idiosyncratic factors, which was his ambition. Reportedly from UK 2003 SDR, Blair has the intention for UK to become the bridge between European and NATO allies and also with the US. The enhancement of UK security relations with EU and NATO was then seen as the effort of Blair to realize his ambition, especially to strengthen the influence of UK in both organizations.

As the aforementioned above, the demeanor of Cameron in terms of UK engagement with EU and NATO was similar with what Blair has been done. It has the meaning that Cameron was the proponent of British engagement with EU and NATO, despite the fact that some of his colleagues in Conservative party oppose the integration with the EU.

UK under Cameron was also active in strengthening relations with both organizations. Especially when it comes to military operations, BAF and NATO forces were oftenly involved in the same operations. One of them was the deployment of Operation Ellamy towards Libya in response to the emergence of Arab Spring. NATO and UK played the key role in conducting military missions in Libya, which then invited other allies to take the same action. In regards to EU relations with UK, Cameron took similar actions with as Blair did, by trying to make a betterment of EU to cope with possible threats and challenges. Cameron also tried to enhance EU military capabilities and readiness under the framework of NATO. However, the driven factor of Cameron’s decision to take serious attention towards the existence of EU and NATO was more to political history, which in this case affected by his Conservative view, as for long time, Conservative party’s regular stance is the proponent of UK integration with regional organizations, especially EU and NATO.
IV.2 Differences or Similarities of Defence Policy under the Tenure of Tony Blair (2001-2007) and David Cameron (2010-2016)

In regards to the cases and issues that have been explained previously, it is clearly seen that both Blair and Cameron were implementing their defence policy in order to respond those issues. By seeing the three-scrutinized Security Policy elements proposed by Laura, the form of their defence policy were basically the deployment of military forces for multinational operations and building up security relations with other country and regional organizations. Therefore, author will try to differentiate the analysis of the defence policy that have been applied by both prime ministers, into the analysis of defence policy for military forces deployment and the analysis of defence policy for regional organizations.

IV.2.1 Defence Policy for Military Forces Deployment

In the case of the attack of 9/11, Blair responded the attack by strengthening security relations with US, which seen from the deployment of Operation Herrick to Afghanistan in order to tackle Al Qaeda and ensuring Afghanistan to be distant from being such terrorist group base. Operation Herrick which firstly launched under Blair government has absorbed a quite high defence budget and defence measurement, which here will be comprising of the deployed troops personnel.

Afterwards, defence policy for military forces deployment under Cameron can be seen through Operation Ellamy. Operation Ellamy which was launched as the response to the emergence of Arab Spring, which particularly intended to help the pro-democracy protesters to oust Gaddafi from power in Libya. This operation was also recognized as the biggest military operation which firstly launched under Cameron, compare to other operations during his tenure.

The analysis of defence policy for military forces deployment under Blair and Cameron tenure can be seen from matrix below:
Table IV.1 Defence Policy for Military Forces Deployment under Tony Blair (2001-2007) and David Cameron (2010-2016)

From the matrix above, the forms of the defence policy are both military forces deployment, which are Operation Herrick under Blair and Operation Ellamy under Cameron. The analysis is simplified through four variables, namely a, b, c, and d. These four variables indicate that the defence policy aspect is contrast of each other.

The defence policy subjects for this research are defence budget and defence measurement, particularly the total deployed troops in each operations. Defence budget indicated by a and b, which has the meaning that Blair and Cameron’s defence budget in relate to the deployment of Operation Herrick and Operation Ellamy was so contrast. The data shows that implicatly from 2002 until the end of Blair administration, the total expenditure of defence budget for Operation Herrick only was £851.2 m, meanwhile Cameron spent only £300 m of defence budget for the deployment of Operation Ellamy.

Afterwards, the second subject is the defence measurement which will be seen through the total deployed troops. Defence measurement between the two premiers is also indicate a different one. Based on the data from UK MoD, the total deployed troops to Afghanistan was 6,200 personnels as per 9 July 2007 since it was launched. However, different from Blair, Cameron sent 2,300 personnels to Libya under the Operation Ellamy. Therefore, it can be seen that

IV.2.2 Defence Policy for Regional Organizations

The second defence policy is in a relation with the regional organizations, such as NATO and EU. The defence policy applied by Blair and Cameron towards both organizations is measured from the security
relations built among the three actors throughout their tenure. The analysis can be seen in the matrix below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defence Policy</th>
<th>Tony Blair</th>
<th>David Cameron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table IV.2 Defence Policy for Regional Organization under Tony Blair (2001-2007) and David Cameron (2010-2016)*

Based on the explanation in the previous chapters, both NATO and EU are recognized as milestones for defence and security enhancement of UK under Blair and Cameron. It can be seen in so many occasions, one of them is the consideration to put NATO and EU within each premiers defence policy structure, namely in Blair’s 2003 SDR and Cameron’s 2010 SDSR.

In the figure above, the analysis is indicated by variable e and f. It has the meaning that, the defence policy towards NATO and EU under Blair and Cameron was similar. Besides military operations, the form of security relations that built by Blair and Cameron with the organizations was basically aiming NATO to be the bedrock of defence of UK and aiming EU to be a stronger alliance for security and defence of its member countries under the framework of NATO.

**IV.2.3 Aspects of the Different or Similar Defence Policy**

In order to sharpen the analysis, author assumes the importance of the aspects of the different or similar defence policy. By analyzing the aspects, the reason why the defence policy that have been applied by Blair and Cameron could be different or similar can be founded. Therefore, when it comes to the discussion of defence policy, it is best to analyze it from three aspects, threat perception, strategic environment, and national interests, referring to the theoretical framework on defence policy of this research. The comparison of the aspects can be seen in the table as follows:
From the table above, the aspects of the different or similar defence policy of Blair and Cameron explain the reasons why their defence policy could be similar or different. Based on the previous table on the analysis of Blair and Cameron’s defence policy on military forces deployment, it can be seen that the defence policy subjects are totally different.

The aspects that could explain the differences are how both prime ministers perceived the threats, how was the strategic environment during both’s tenure, and what is the national interest of the prime ministers. Blair’s threat perception in regards to the case was definitely about terrorism, in the table represented by variable a, while Cameron’s threat perception was dictatorship, which represented by variable b. Terrorism here was seen more catastrophic compare to the dictatorship posed by Libyan government during Cameron’s tenure, which then resulted to the higher defence budget and measurement compare to Cameron’s. The second aspect is the strategic environment that also shows the difference. Blair’s strategic environment (variable c) was affected by most of the Western allies were hand-in-hand to support US’ Global War on Terrorism policy. Meanwhile, Cameron’s strategic environment (variable d) which then brought impact to his defence policy towards Libyan regime was more
to the turbulent relations between UK and Libya for decades. The relations of two states were then escalated during the emergence of revolution of Arab Spring. The last aspect is the national interest of both prime ministers. The different national interest also affect to the different defence policy. Blair’s interest (variable e) was purely to combat terrorism, especially to tackle Al Qaeda and its affiliate the Taliban. Whereas, Cameron’s interest (variable f) as analyzed in this research was to tople the Libyan regime, Moammar Al Gaddafi and substitute it with a more ‘pro-Western’ and democratic regime for Libya.

The second defence policy is for the regional organization. The elements of aspects are similar with the aspects in the first defence policy. By referring to Table IV.2, the defence policy of Blair and Cameron was similar towards NATO and EU. Blair and Cameron’s threat perception in the case of regional organization was characterized by the needs of UK to work stronger with other regional allies in order to counter the political uncertainty and the more various threats in the 21st century, such as terrorism, state-to-state military attack, and so on and so forth. As for this case, NATO and EU are seen as the most compatible regional allies to cooperate with. The second aspect is both prime ministers’ strategic environment which according to the official document from UK House of Commons, the strategic environment of UK starting from Blair administration upwards, including to Cameron’s administration characterized by the occurrence of 9/11 that believed has altered governmental aspects of UK. 9/11 has undeniably shaped the contemporary world politics and even the stance of UK at the international stage. The last aspect is the national interest of the two prime ministers. Blair and Cameron have mentioned in their SDR and SDSR about the importance of NATO

---
and EU for UK’s security, which urge them to build a more comprehensive security relations amongst them reciprocally.

IV.3 Chapter Summary

As this chapter aims to answer the question of this research, that is the differences or similarities of the defence policy under Tony Blair and David Cameron tenure, it is imperative to analyze the relations of the idiosyncratic factors of both prime ministers towards their defence policy. Besides, the aspects of the different or similar defence policy are important to be analyzed since it will explain the reason why the defence policy could be similar or different.

By referring to the aforementioned theory, the analysis of the defence policy is divided into two forms, which are the defence policy for military forces deployment and defence policy for regional organizations. The implication of idiosyncratic factors of both premiers was quite significant in this defence policy. Blair’s defence policy on military forces deployment was driven by his belief shaped during his college and the defence policy for the regional organization was driven by his ambition factor to become the bridge between NATO and EU. Meanwhile, Cameron’s idiosyncrasy that drove his defence policy towards Libya was his perception in which Gaddafi is a threat for British interests. Whereas, the idiosyncratic factor of political history of Conservative party which for decades has been actively involved with the engagement of UK with NATO and EU, played the role in Cameron’s defence policy towards regional organization.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The significance of UK influence in the contemporary international politics is undeniable. Ever since the end of World War II and the end of the Cold War between the two blocs, the security dynamics of international system becomes more complex. This has driven UK to strengthening its security and widening its influence in international politics. The influence that UK has spread might pose more complex threats towards UK’s national interests and security. In order to maintain the security and influence, UK’s leaders shall consider strong and firm defence policy, as the main tool to deter the threats.

Both’s administration were also characterized by the occurrence of international events which believed affect the international politics in general, including for UK. Blair’s tenure was marked by 9/11 attack and Cameron’s tenure was marked by Arab Spring. The two events have urged the two prime ministers to take actions in order to ensuring the security of British soil and people. 9/11 which posed terrorism threat not only to US but UK as well has invited Blair to deploy BAF to Afghanistan in order to tackle the extremist organization, namely Al Qaeda. Years after Blair era, the revolution that hit some of the countries in Middle Eastern and Northern African region has absorbed the attention of UK, which at that time ruled by Cameron. Libya, one of the countries that experienced the revolution by its people also seen threatened the security of British nationals there. As response to that, Cameron also deploy BAF for humanitarian intervention to Libya with another agenda to oust the perceived dictator, Moammar Al Gaddafi.

The security relations between UK and other organizations also important in the implementation of defence policy. For decades, UK under its former prime ministers has tried to build a strong alliance with NATO and EU, as these two organizations perceived as the significant UK allies in Euro-Atlantic region. The cooperation that the alliances has done together, even in some military operations, showed a strong commitment of the alliances in deter what perceived as common threat.
However, when it comes to the implementation of defence policy by state leaders, the idiosyncracy of the leaders has portion to take the role. The idiosyncratic factors can affect the leader in implementing his or her defence policy, including UK two former prime ministers, Blair and Cameron. By referring to several elements in idiosyncratic factors, the belief and ambition factors have driven Blair to conduct his defence policy during his tenure. Whereas, for Cameron, perception and political history were the driven idiosyncratic factors for him to implement his defence policy.

As for this research, the defence policy which theoretically could take form of the deployment of military forces for multinational operations and building up security relations with other country and other regional organizations were analyzed as the defence policy that implemented by Blair and Cameron in regards to each premier’s case. Therefore, the different threat perception, national interest, and strategic environment in Blair and Cameron’s administration has resulted into the different defence policy for military forces deployment. However, similar threat perception, national interest, and strategic environment during both’s tenure resulted to the similar defence policy for regional organization.

Blair administration post-9/11 that the most concerned-threat was terrorism has affected his decision to combat any organization, especially Al Qaeda in Afghanistan that pose terrorism towards British soil and nationals. The decision has also been influenced by the external environment which at that time most of the Western allies were supporting US’ Global War on Terrorism policy. Meanwhile, Cameron’s perceived threat of dictatorship has strengthened his interest to change the regime of Libya under Gaddafi. This can be affected by the environment of a longstanding turbulent relationship between UK and Libya, which then jeopardized after the emergence of Arab Spring.

Contrast with the defence policy for military forces deployment, Blair and Cameron’s defence policy for regional organizations was triggered by the emergence of political uncertainty and more complex threats in the 21st century. This also affected by the post-9/11 strategic environment of UK during both
premiers’ tenure, which has shaped the contemporary world politics and UK stance in the international stage. The perceived common threats and the changing strategic environment drove UK’s interest to build a more comprehensive security relation with regional organizations, most importantly NATO and EU.
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