



PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
FACULTY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

MASTER IN  
Literature and Civilization

**David Cameron's Liberal Interventionism  
in the British Foreign Policy (2010-2016)**

Submitted by

**KADDOUR Khadidja**

**Board of Examiners:**

**Chairperson: Mrs. BAHRAOUI S.**

**Supervisor: Mr. TEGUIA C.**

**Examiner: Mrs. REZGA**

**Academic year: 2017-2018**

## **Dedication**

To my parents and family members

To my mates and friends

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express special thanks and the deepest gratitude to my supervisor, **Mr. TEGUIA Cherif** for directing this work. I am really grateful to him for his support, patience, guidance, and for giving me the chance to work on my own.

I would like to thank the board of examiners who agreed to read this work and to the teachers, mates and friends who provided me with help or taught me something.

Finally, I humbly and gratefully thank all those who have contributed, in a way or another, to make this work successful.

## **Abstract**

Throughout the twenty-first century, Britain has witnessed the leadership of three prime ministers. This work focuses on the premiership of David Cameron and his interventions, particularly at the level of foreign affairs. When Cameron came to rule Britain was going through economic crises, he had a new approach of intervention, as it was shifted from liberal interventionism to liberal conservatism. Cameron had to take a tough decision, which allowed Britain had a powerful place in EU and the world; together with retention the stronger relationship with the world, yet some decisions had a negative side. The work is divided into three chapters. The first introduces the British foreign policy in the twenty-first century. The second one is devoted to the profile of Cameron. The last one sheds light on some major instances of interventionism practiced by Cameron. Most of the time, Cameron's interventions in the EU are economic; whereas his interventions in others parts of the world are more strategic, diplomatic and political.

**Keywords:** Britain, Cameron, Interventionism, Liberal and Conservative, Foreign Policy.

## Table of Contents

<b>Dedication</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>General Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>

### **Chapter One: Contemporary Britain's Foreign Policy**

Introduction.....	4
1. The Shape of the British Foreign Policy .....	5
1.1 The Foreign Policy Making Process .....	5
1.2 The Role of the Prime Minister .....	6
2. The British Foreign Policy in the Twenty First Century .....	7
2.1 The Anglo-American Special Relationships .....	8
2.2 British-European Relationships .....	10
2.3 Britain's Relations with Other Countries .....	12
Conclusion.....	14

### **Chapter Two: David Cameron**

Introduction .....	15
1. David Cameron's Profile.....	16
1.1 David Cameron's Biography .....	16
1.2 Cameron as the Leader of the Conservative Party .....	17
1.3 David Cameron as a Prime Minister .....	22
2. Cameron's Foreign Policy in the EU .....	25
Conclusion.....	28

## Chapter Three: Cameron's Interventionism

Introduction .....	30
1. From Liberal Interventionism to Liberal Conservatism.....	31
2. The Blair Legacy .....	32
3. The Brown Government .....	33
4. Cameron's Ministership .....	35
4.1 Interventionism in the World.. .....	36
4.1.1 Action in Iraq .....	36
4.1.2 Action in Libya .....	38
4.1.3 Actions in Syria .....	39
Conclusion .....	41
<b>General Conclusion .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Works Cited .....</b>	<b>44</b>

## **General Introduction**

Throughout history, Britain has had an active role in shaping the world's policies. This is mostly due to the centre of power namely the prime minister, who is considered as the reflection of the kingdom's image internally and internationally. In fact, many prime ministers are remembered for the role they played in running the country especially during the last few decades. Such period was full of decisive events that affected the kingdom directly or indirectly leading to the reshaping of its domestic and overseas affairs. This was mostly witnessed during Tony Blair and David Cameron's premierships during which the world witnessed the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks on USA, the Arab uprising commonly called the Arab Spring and above all the turbulent relationship with the EU that ended with the Brexit.

Both Tony Blair and David Cameron were pivotal in the UK affairs. The former was a labour known for adopting the doctrine of the International Community. He was also known for putting emphasis on the foreign policies and was more engaged with the human rights, which later revealed to be a façade used to cover for other interests, as in the case of the Iraqi war. Unlike his predecessor, the conservative leader David Cameron sought changes to heal the British society. His view was to build up a country where everyone could succeed, whatever their background was.

David Cameron came to power on 11 May 2010 after the resignation of Gordon Brown. He was the youngest prime minister of Britain, but he was not elected, he was actually invited by Queen Elizabeth II. During that period, Britain was facing economic crises and Cameron had to introduce changes in all the domains by taking tough decisions. Internationally, the prime minister had also to take non-easy decisions, though it was not his own as the house of commons was given the green light to participate in these decisions.

Hence, this work aims at identifying the instances of intervention in Cameron's premiership, comparing it to that of Blair and Brown. Furthermore, it will shed light on interventionism both in Europe and the world, highlighting the main actions that were led by Cameron.

To achieve these aims, the following questions are raised:

1. What characterizes the policy of Cameron's interventionism?
2. To what extent has Cameron's interventionism been implemented in the British Foreign policy in Europe and the world?

As possible answers, several hypotheses have been suggested and are:

- Cameron's interventionism is much more applied in economic issues with EU and much more in strategic and political ones in the world.
- Cameron's interventionism has been liberally and conservatively acted to a considerable extent.

For that, this thesis has been divided into three chapters; the first one highlights contemporary British foreign policy, starting with the shape of British foreign policy and the role of the prime minister. Then, light is shed on the British foreign policy throughout the twentieth century; and how the British political context has moved through shifts over the last few decades both at home and abroad, together with British relationships with America and Europe. The second chapter is devoted to the exploration of Cameron's profile, starting with his biography, career, and life before being a prime minister. We will mention his role in his conservative party, and as a prime minister; without forgetting his intervention in the EU.

Finally, the last chapter focuses on interventionism from Blair to Cameron, in order to contrast the policy affairs among the three prime ministers, Blair, Brown, Cameron. Then, more light will be shed on how Cameron shifted from liberal interventionism to liberal conservatism, focusing on the premiership of all of Blair, Brown and Cameron; and finishing with Cameron interventionism in the world focusing on the main action that the prime minister was involved in foreign countries' affairs such as Iraq and Libya.

# CHAPTER ONE:

# CONTEMPORARY BRITAIN'S FOREIGN POLICY

## **Introduction**

As one of the main countries in Europe, Britain has a major influence on the international politics. The present chapter of the study introduces the organization of the British foreign policy. That is achieved by showing the policy making process as well as the role that the Prime Minister has in such process. It includes the main dimensions of British foreign policy. That is, the main demonstrations of that policy towards the United States (US), the European Union (EU) and towards the world.

## **1. The Shape of the British Foreign Policy**

Each state in the world has its policy in the international field. As ever all countries share similar strategies and ways of treating other countries politically, economically and socially. At the level of international affairs, each country has its own shape, nature and aspect for its foreign policy. In this part of the study, the organization of British foreign policy will be showed. Moreover, the role of the Prime Minister is demonstrated and discussed.

### **1.1 The Foreign Policy Making Process**

The shape of foreign policy in the UK is traditional. That is, the process that shows how the British foreign policy is like depends on the incorporated influential institutions. To clarify, there are two main institutions in the field of policy making. One of them is the Prime Minister Office, and another is the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). What makes it even traditional is that other ministries are noticed in the policy making process. Indeed, there is a collaboration among all those institutions. Missions and affairs are well organized and well distributed, and that is the real collaboration. (Heffernan 348)

The policies centered by government are coordinated with all procedures and organizations. Those coordinated items have a core executive role in the policy making process. The Core Executive model demonstrates the interdependent actors and the interacting institutions that the British government has. Those institutions and actors overlap and interlock within several networks (Heffernan 350-351). Because each actor in the scene of policy making has their own resources, they represent an interdependent element in the Core Executive model. The resources of almost all actors are needed for the Prime Minister empowerment. That is, a Prime Minister enhances his or her power through others' resources, and that shows no absoluteness in the Prime Minister power. (Prišmantaitė 42-43)

## 1.2 The Role of the Prime Minister

The Cabinet, the collective decision-making body of the queen's Government composed of the Prime Minister and other ministers, consists of members who are selected and dismissed by the Prime Minister. The Cabinet Agenda, moreover, is implemented under his control. Even consensus is called by the Cabinet's chairman, the Prime Minister. The members of the Cabinet can refuse or accept anything, but the offers are given by the Prime Minister. That, thus, shows the distinguishable power of the Prime Minister from actors like departmental ministers. (O'Malley 4-5).

As a dominant actor in the system, the Prime Minister always uses a major power and influence he has in foreign policy making process. That shows the Prime Minister as “a more powerful” or even “the main element” in the Core Executive model. As a minister among other ministers, the Prime Minister is the leader of his party whose position is empowered by the whole party's power. Yet, being of that strength, the Prime Minister has –more than other ministers- many commitments and responsibilities. (O'Malley 2)

Because there are institutions like parliament and departments, mostly the Prime Minister cannot direct the foreign policy by himself. For that O'Malley asserted that the Prime Minister has no direct function in the policy-making (6). However, the Prime Minister has institutional power resources. Being a legal head of the Government, having the right of proposal and veto, Delegating powers and responsibilities to ministers and departments, setting the policy agenda, organizing a de facto prime ministerial department and setting the Government's political Agenda (Heffernan 354-355).

## 2. The British Foreign Policy in the Twenty First Century

Several political, economic, social and cultural events can affect any policy that a country adopts, executes and defends. The powerful European country, Great Britain, has witnessed some changes since the end of the Cold War (1990s). Moreover, the British policy context has moved through shifts over the last few decades, both at home and abroad. The foreign policy, thus, has eventually started to have a new shape. Starting from the 9/11 events, going through Blair then Cameron premierships, moving to the Arab Spring and above all the relationship with the EU countries during those few decades.

Before checking those areas of practicing policies, it is important to review the perspective that the British foreign secretary, Jack Straw, foreshadowed in 2003:

"Since 1997 the Labour Government has helped to reshape Europe after the cold war. We have championed wider EU and NATO membership and confronted dictatorship in Kosovo. Outside Europe we have used our leading role in the UN, the EU and other international bodies to promote peace and security in Sierra Leone, East Timor, the Middle East and the sub-continent. We have joined military action to confront terrorism in Afghanistan and to enforce Security Council decisions in Iraq. Across the world we have worked to alleviate poverty and defend human rights." (UK International Priorities 1)

It seems that such foreword can shape the UK foreign policy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. At that time, it would have revisited the political and diplomatic contributions and involvements of Britain in the world. However, through the following subtitles, the background and the expectations of UK foreign policy by the turn of the century will be shown.

## 2.1 The Anglo-American Special Relationships

Throughout the passing century and after the turn of the century, Britain has been the closest ally and supporter of the U.S. The Anglo-American relations have been “special” ever since the American Revolution in 1775 or even longer. Their special relationship has lived through enmity, cooperation and close friendship (Reynolds, 2005:14). Relative economic declines that one of them may witness have always been synchronous with an economic rise in the other country. Therefore, the 20<sup>th</sup> century lived Anglo-American intense economic and political ties. Despite the rifts in such relations, the US and UK's cooperation has persisted in the international security and defense (Lehmkuhl 13-14).

The British Foreign Affairs Committee drew a conclusion in its February 2002 report that may summarize the shift in the special relationships' policies by the start of the third millennium:

“The need for it [the Anglo-American relationship, U.L.] to remain a forward-looking relationship is just as important in the 21st century [...]. There can be no more important relationship for the United Kingdom” (Foreign Affairs Committee).

That shadows some drawbacks in UK-US policy of alliance in the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although the UK-US hegemony –that is represented in the leadership and partnership in many organizations like the NATO- was much more important to one country than to another. For that, the Foreign Affairs Committee highlighted such importance for Britain.

Kathleen Burk's book "Old World, New World", published in 2007, surveys a four-century review of the story of Britain and America. Political, military, and diplomatic levels are tackled. In addition, her narrative is characterized by the central argument that “the United States and Great Britain had always been competitors, being driven together as allies only

when there was a threat greater than either could handle alone” (644). Reaching the time of Blair-Bush alliance, Burk highlights the military and economic cooperation in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

However, Tony Blair had very little foreign policy experience (Lehmkuhl 22). After becoming the Prime Minister in May 1997, he acknowledged the diplomatic skills and international relationships that would give the UK a status of privilege. On November, 10<sup>th</sup> 1997, at the Lord Mayor’s banquet, Blair spoke about UK foreign policy with an international vision. He claimed: “By virtue of our geography, our history and the strengths of our people, Britain is a global player”(Blair 1997). Following that claim, he emphasized the role of Britain in the world.

Blair added then that Britain’s relationship with the United States is of prime importance by virtue of their "historical alliances"(Blair 1997). At that time, there was a need for strengthening British involvement in the European integration. Blair, in addition, referred to the need of people all over the world to other people implies the responsibility of what he named "international community" (Runciman 6). After the attacks of 9/11 on the US, and in the time of Blair premiership, shared values, history and kinship ties were depicting the Anglo-American relations. Notwithstanding the European opposition, Blair supported Bush for that allying the US is of less risks than allying the EU. (Runciman 13).

The new British governments of Gordon Brown and David Cameron brought a new British self-perception and a new political framing of the Anglo-American relations. Cameron showed only acknowledgement to the power of that relation. In an interview with the Economist in March 2010, two months before his Premiership following Brown's resignation, Cameron asserted that the special relationship is “real” and “tangible” and that “it does mean something”. However, he confirmed that Britain is “the junior partner in that relationship” and

that “part of getting the relationship right is understanding how best to play the role of the junior partner” (The Economist 2010).

Generally, the British-American cooperation has always been preserving and improving both countries' powers. As for Britain, the special relationship constituted always one of the “three circles of influence”. Britain's relationships were involved in two other circles, one of them constitutes its relation with the Commonwealth (that is an intergovernmental organization of 53 member states that are mostly former territories of the British Empire) and another constitutes its relations with Europe (Reynolds 93-94). Britain is considered, as Reynolds adds, a power that swings and wields in those circles as a fulcrum within a wheel. (Reynolds 94) Among the other circles, as it has been mentioned, is Europe. Then how were the British-European relations characterized in the last few decades?

## **2.2 British-European Relationships**

The context of British foreign policy has noticed some changes over the last two decades. The same as with the American ties, Britain, as a country in Europe, has its issues, relations and conflicts with European countries. In the last decades of the twentieth century, British foreign policy's priorities and modalities became under increasing fire, namely in the European sphere. At that time, the Conservative Party has become more suspicious of diplomacy and diplomats. Moreover, the general awakening of public interest in foreign policy has entered the British-European field. (Hill 68)

The British role in Europe has always been representing a key aspect of British foreign policy. The British membership in the EU was a factor of implementing the national interests of its foreign policy. Since 1973, joining the European Economic Community influenced positively on the British prosperity. As the European market benefited from the important part of British companies, services and products; the active role Britain had in the EU was

initiating the EU economic reform (Straw 35). Transferring the national interests to the EU level was another determination that Britain's role in Europe showed.

After the coming of the Labour government in 1997, there were intentions and ambitions of empowering the British role in the EU. The New Labour (Gordon Brown's government), then, wanted to take the leadership of the EU. A balance was required in the British foreign policy, for that Britain did not want to abandon the special relationship with the US. The balance was between the special relationship and the role in the EU (Prišmantaitė 42). Thus, throughout the last few decades, the British preference between the US relationship or the EU role remained in its foreign policy.

Lunn, Miller and Smith listed three key motifs of Blair premiership. Apart from maintaining a powerful alliance with the US, they mentioned applying the philosophy of “interventionism” and positioning Britain at the heart of Europe (3). Blair, from his election as Prime Minister, was committed to strengthening the British ties with the EU. He was also committed to involving Britain in the ongoing and dynamic process of European integration (Lehmkuhl 22).

The New Labour government of Blair came with a programme that sought to develop the British European relationship. New approaches to suggest such close relation were presented. It was necessary for Britain to be the main negotiator on European issues, that is to advance positive roles in the EU. However, after the attacks of 9/11, Britain went back to the special relationship preference. The war on terror by the British American alliance was a strong proof for the EU countries that Europe is not among Britain's priorities. (Lunn et al., 2008).

Notwithstanding being an initiator of European security and defense policy, the British commitment to NATO showed the priority that Britain gave to NATO rather than EU,

particularly in defense policy (Prišmantaitė 44). Britain kept choosing priorities in its foreign policy; yet, it kept opposing the EU initiatives that narrow the British sovereignty. Kristina Prišmantaitė describes briefly the British foreign policy towards Europe as:

"British foreign policy towards Europe in the 21st century could be characterized using the term "pragmatism". The term "pragmatism" means that Britain chooses such EU areas where it sees a potential to take a leading role which lets to implement its foreign policy's goals and priorities." (Prišmantaitė 44).

Through her words, pragmatism in British foreign policy does not seem to be a fixed aspect or rule that the British Prime Ministers tend to follow or believe in. Rather, the case for British policy in European agenda has had priorities that serve what Britain seeks to implement in Europe.

Notwithstanding its withdrawal from the EU (the Brexit in 2017), British foreign policy towards Europe still remains a debatable issue. As a skeptical EU member for a long time, 44% of its people saw no benefit from its membership in the EU according to Eurobarometer report in 2007. However, the number decreased to 39% in the following year (Eurobarometer report, 2008). That shows no clarity exists -even in public- about Britain-Europe relations.

### **2.3 Britain's Relations with Other Countries**

The times of Blair and Brown were as a break to the past for that they used a modernization agenda. Some of the most memorable British foreign policy adventures were the wars on terror and the rise of global poverty in the times of Blair and Brown in office. That featured the New Labour foreign policy. Daddow & Gaskarth described the New Labour project as:

"It is important to judge the governments against the benchmarks they initially set themselves, rather than those upon which they inadvertently stumbled towards the middle and end of the Blair-Brown years. Arguably the most controversial – and supposedly novel – aspect of New Labour's foreign policy from the outset was its assertion of an 'ethical dimension' to external policy-making." (4)

Throughout those years, Britain insisted on the democratic rights of other countries and, hence, supported them. Those words also reflect how the foreign policy in the British offices justified towards other states through putting human rights in the heart of policy.

By the turn of the first decade in this century, the revolutions in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya, and the civil uprisings in other countries like Bahrain, Syria, and Yemen rose and were referred to as the Arab Spring. The latter was a challenge for the foreign and security policies. However, for Britain, any involvements, claims or commitments were justified by the call for human rights on the one hand, and by supporting nations to decide their rulers and systems. On the other hand, there have always been intentions for imperial relations with such states that get in trouble (Daddow & Gaskarth 104)

As Cameron's predecessors did, he referred to the legacy of imperial relations by claiming: "there are some real opportunities for Britain in some areas of the world where we underplay our relationships". As Cameron explicitly added, the policy of imperial ties with the Gulf region, South East Asia and other countries. Britain, as Cameron said, could get "great benefit from giving more time and effort and resources" to make good ties with these countries (as cited in Lehmkuhl 26). The goal of such policy was to help and support other countries.

**Conclusion**

Every period of ruling has its aspects. That is, each leader has his or her own impact on the way policy is made, processed and executed. As throughout various premierships in the British history, many Prime Ministers had their touches in the foreign policy of Britain like Winston Churchill, Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair and others. Based on the present chapter of the study as a background, the following chapter introduces a prominent prime minister in the history of British foreign policy, particularly in the British-European relations.

# CHAPTER TWO:

# DAVID CAMERON

## **Introduction**

The British politician David William Donald Cameron at a young age served as a Member of Parliament for four years (2001-2005), then as the leader of Britain's Conservative Party for five years (2005-2010), to become, in 2010, the youngest Prime Minister in the UK in almost two centuries. Although during his leadership, Britain shined again but each beginning has an end and Cameron was unexpected, when he announced his resignation in 2016 after the United Kingdom had voted to leave the European Union; leaving politics after years of hard work.

## **1. David Cameron's Profile**

In this part, an introduction to David Cameron's biography and political career is presented. Before showing Cameron's foreign policy, one should be aware of who Cameron is, what his labour is, and how he became as a prime minister.

### **1.1 David Cameron's Biography**

David William Donald Cameron was born on October 9<sup>th</sup>, 1966, in London; to a wealthy family. After attending the elite Heatherdown Preparatory School, Cameron went on to prestigious Eton College at the age of 13. Then, He continued his studies in Brasenose College, Oxford, from which he graduated in 1988 with a first-class honors degree in philosophy, politics and economics. (Tejvan, 2011)

Upon graduating, he worked for the Conservative Research Department for five years; then he started working with John Major, helping him in preparing the common Commons debates. In 1992, Cameron's help was personalized in the unexpected win of election by Major. After the elections Cameron was assigned as a Special Adviser to the Chancellor and then Special Adviser to the Home Secretary.

In 1994, he moved far away from politics to work for a private company "British Media Company" as director for Carlton Communications. In 1996; Cameron married Samantha, with whom he had four children.

In 2001 Cameron's fame began to shine by winning a seat at parliament to represent Oxfordshire town of Witney, where he gained a high profile for speaking out on national issues. After his victory; Cameron held a number of positions on the Opposition Front Bench prior to becoming Party Leader.

In 2003, Cameron held the positions of Shadow Deputy Leader of the House of Commons. In 2004, he became the Front Bench Spokesman for Local Government Finance; and in May 2005, he was appointed as the Head of Policy Co-ordination in the run-up to the General Election. After 2005 general elections, he was appointed as the Shadow Secretary of State for Education and Skills.

In 2005, Michael Howard the leader of the Conservative party announced his resigning, leaving the leadership wide open, and giving a golden chance to the young Cameron, who won the elections of December, 2005; and, thus, becoming the new leader of the conservative party. Thanks to him, he took his party. In 2010 general election, Cameron's party secured 306 seats. Although this was the highest total, it was short of majority by 20 seats. This led to a coalition government between the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats. On May 11<sup>th</sup> 2010, Cameron became the new prime minister of the British Kingdom, being the youngest Prime Minister in almost two centuries.

## **1.2 Cameron as the Leader of the Conservative Party**

The Conservatives are mainly considered as the Western world's oldest and most successful political party, dominating British politics in both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, thanks to their ruthless fixation with gaining and maintaining power. Ideology, loyalty to the leader and internal democracy were all subordinated to this end.

The conservatives had a huge success; though, while they were enjoying the taste of victory. Some Conservatives considered it as the root cause of their electoral problems. by forcing Labor to accept their agenda, They are becoming the victims of their own success and creating a new consensus and neutralized one of the most compelling reasons for

voting Conservative. Indeed, their vision comes true after the collapse of the Conservatives' reputation for economic competence after 'Black Wednesday'<sup>1</sup> in September 1992.

In May 2005 general election, Michael Howard announced his resignation as leader of the Conservative Party. This gave Cameron an opportunity to be a leader, so on 29 September 2005 he announced that he would be a candidate.

The central message of Cameron's leadership campaign was that the party must 'change to win' (Cameron, 2005). He has described himself as a 'liberal Conservative' as he announced in his interview with journalist Andrew Marr for BBC News in May, 2010; week after taking his post "I believe there...I've always described myself as a Liberal Conservative. I'm Liberal because I believe in freedom and human rights, but Conservative - I'm skeptical of great schemes to remake the world" (BBC News, 2010).

In the first ballot of Conservative MPs, David Davis had fewer than predicted at 62 votes and Cameron came second, with 56 votes. Thus, in the second ballot, Cameron won 134,446 votes to Davis's 64,398.

"We knew how to rescue Britain from Old Labor. We knew how to win the battle of ideas with Old Labour. We did not know how to deal with our own victory in that battle of ideas. That victory left us with an identity crisis. Having defined ourselves for many years as the anti-socialist Party, how were we to define ourselves once full-blooded socialism had disappeared from the political landscape"(Cameron, 2005). This was Cameron's words after becoming the leader of the conservative party.

The first step of the conservative's decision to change was to emphasize taxation, immigration, and Europe as areas of policy different from Labour. At the same time Cameron

---

<sup>1</sup> Black Wednesday occurred in the United Kingdom on 16 September 1992, when John Major's Conservative government was forced to withdraw the pound sterling from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) after it was unable to keep the pound above its agreed lower limit in the ERM

had talked about the need to heal Britain's 'broken society', citing problems such as poverty, drug abuse, debt, family breakdown and educational failure. He called the politicians to focus 'not just on Gross domestic product (GDP), but on General Well-Being (GWB)' and claiming that: 'It's time we admitted that there's more to life than money' (BBC,2006)

In contrast to Duncan Smith, Cameron portrayed himself as a social liberal, at ease with contemporary British society. He wanted to change society, because if he could change society everything else would be easier.

For this Cameron gave a speech entitled 'Stronger Families' to relate the family counseling service, in June 2008. His words were somehow similar to that of the Conservative politician William Hague's comments a decade earlier, when he noted that 'for too long, politicians here have been afraid of getting into this territory, for fear of looking old-fashioned or preachy' (Cameron, 2008). His speech can be summarized in seeing marriage once again as a 'positive social norm'; he observed that family is 'the best institution' for raising children.

"Yes, I do think it's wrong that our benefits system gives couples with children more money if they live apart – and we will bring an end to the couple penalty. And yes, I do think it's wrong that we're the only country in the western world that doesn't properly recognize marriage in the tax system – and I will ensure that we do. So we will change tax and benefits to make them more family-friendly." (Cameron, 2008).

He also made it clear, that any tax cuts for married couples would also apply equally to people in civil partnerships. This represented a significant shift in the Conservatives' attitude towards homosexuality. To this end, the Conservatives have also actively recruited gay prospective parliamentary candidates and given them priority in winnable seats (Woolf,

2006). The party has also signed an agreement with Stonewall (the gay rights pressure group) to become part of its 'Diversity Champions' programme of gay friendly employers (Grimston 2006).

Cameron comment on that saying: 'I welcome this report's emphasis on the family, and on marriage, as the basis for the social progress we all want to see' adding that: 'If we can get the family right, we can fix our broken society' (Conservatives.com, 2007) He clearly declared that any relationship out of the marriage institution is damaging the society. As the family breakdown is the essential reason of crimes, drug abuse, educational failure and anti-social behavior. So, the state should therefore create a policy to support marriage and end the downgrading of marriage.

Though for scholars like Toynbee, this policy represents a return to traditionalist, socially authoritarian conservatism; the Daily Mail also argues that: 'His marriage policy is their victory, boxing him into their own moral agenda without any idea yet how it can be done, at what cost – and with what collateral damage' It is 'reactionary mood music' that risks alienating supporters attracted to the fold by Cameron's ostensibly liberal outlook (Toynbee, 2007).

The Conservatives have frequently dreaded, they are the characteristic party of the minority in Britain, a dread supported today by the contracting of the Conservatives' center vote following Labour's triumph in 1997. Cameron looked to address Conservative disagreeability by moving to the middle and promising to coordinate Labour's social vote based spending designs. Be that as it may, the budgetary emergency saw him return to Conservative financial universality. The Conservatives came back to the electorate with a pronouncement of conservation practically identical to those that had lost it the 2001 and 2005 decisions. It was coalition with the Liberal Democrats – not a huge change in

arrangement or appointive system – that permitted David Cameron to end up noticeably executive.

Gary Streeter MP suggested that future Conservative government would see numerous challenges such as public service reform, terrorism, and relations with the EU, but ‘none will be greater than the social challenges of drugs, rising crime, alienation and intergenerational poverty’. Similarly, David Willetts argued that Conservative politics had to go beyond economics. He argued that Conservatives was everything in between the individual and the state’. But for him, ‘how we sustain and support that rich social architecture... is the real challenge for politics today’ (Willetts, 58).

Likewise, Oliver Letwin MP (2003) has called for Conservatives to foster a ‘neighborly society’ in which social duties and obligations have the same importance and recognition as the pursuit of material gain.

David Pilbeam, American academic and paleoanthropologist, pointed on another point which is the lack of confidence amongst Conservatives that cultural and moral concerns are being sufficiently addressed by intermediate institutions such as families, churches, and schools: ‘There is thus good reason for them to concern themselves with the condition of the wider social fabric, even to the extent of questioning its neglect by conservatives of the past’ (87).

During his leadership of the party, Cameron promoted social justice and social action; advanced the green agenda; and an increase in the number of women and ethnic minority candidates standing for the Conservative Party and elected to Parliament.

The vision he had, was a country where everyone, whatever their background was, they could succeed. Ultimately, it came back to some core values: aspiration, compassion, responsibility, freedom. These are the things David Cameron believed in. They underpinned

his leadership of the Conservative Party and his premiership, and they lie at the heart of his One Nation vision.

On 11 May 2010, Queen Elizabeth II invited Cameron to be the new Prime Minister after the resignation of Gordon Brown, to be the second youngest Prime Minister in the British history after William Pitt (who became the youngest British prime minister in 1783 at the age of 24).

### **1.3 David Cameron as a Prime Minister**

David Cameron served as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from 2010 to 2016. Cameron announced that he would "put aside party differences and work hard for the common good and for the national interest." (Andrew, 205)

When Cameron came to power, Britain was in a moment of economic crisis, he described this as "even worse than we thought" and pointed that changes would take place. And indeed, under his leadership, the UK witnessed a huge change in all the fields. He cut taxes, introduced a new National Living Wage, transformed education, reformed welfare, protected the National Health Service, and increased pensions.

These difficult decisions Cameron took meant also that while the economy grew, the number of families stuck on welfare fell; the number of students attending university, including those from disadvantaged backgrounds; and the number of people in work was higher than at any previous point in British history.

At the same time; economy saw a huge transformation, as over two-thirds and more than one million businesses set-up was reduced. This led to the creation of a record number of jobs. It led Britain to witness the fastest-growing major advanced economy in the world. He

also passed the UK's Same Sex Marriage Act, which enabled the couples whatever their sex is to get married.

Immigration on the other side was subject of discussion from and to EU. So, Cameron had to make a decision concerning this fact. He commented on saying that "in the last decade we have had an immigration policy that's completely lax. The pressure it puts on our public services and communities is too great." (BBC, 2006)

Though, the step he took failed to reduce the number of immigration to UK. According to the Office for National Statistics "a net flow of 298,000 migrants to the UK, in the 12 months to September 2014 up from 210,000 in the previous year" (Andrew, 300)

On the international side, David Cameron developed a well-defined foreign policy. In Asia, Britain built a strong partnership with India and China in the West; with Russia, he designed more aggressive plans. Britain had also a special relationship with the US, working closely with President Barack Obama.

Under his leadership, he had plans with the post-Iraq era, which addressed the new challenges of the Arab Spring, while ensuring that Britain played a full role in the global fight against ISIS and Al Qaeda.

In July 2010, Cameron had a flight to Turkey, where he stayed in Ankara. In his speech Cameron showed his support for Turkey to be a member in the EU as he stated economic and political considerations at the same time he pointed out that the ones who did not support Turkish membership were driven by "protectionism, narrow nationalism or prejudice".( BBC, 2016)

However, in his EU referendum campaign, he announced that Turkey was unlikely to be ready to join the EU until the year 3000 at its current rate of progress. (PM's speech in Turkey: 2010)

In his speech in Ankara, Cameron showed his support to the Palestinian case; where he criticized Israeli actions during the Gaza flotilla raid (31 May 2010) and its Gaza policy, pointing out that Israel had turned Gaza into a "prison camp", having previously referred to Gaza as "a giant open prison". (PM's speech in Turkey: 2010)

Concerning the Libyan civil war, Cameron did not accept what was going with the anti-Gaddafi protest and he convinced the United Nations Security Council to approve a no-fly zone to prevent government forces loyal to Muammar Gaddafi from carrying out air attacks on anti-Gaddafi rebels, which was given the green light on 19 March 2011 to fire more than 110 Tomahawk missiles at targets in Libya. (BBC News: 2011)

However, in March 2003, US forces, British and other countries led an invasion of Iraq. The British forces in Iraq at that period reached 46 thousand soldiers, but this number was decreasing year after year till May 2009; it reached 4100 soldiers, when Britain officially withdrew its troops from Iraq. (BBC 2014)

David Cameron claims that the failures in Iraq had placed Britain at greater risk of terrorist attacks in the UK. He saw that the Islamic State poses a direct risk to their country, namely the jihadis who fought in Syria and Iraq. He stated that:

“they may well bring mayhem to our streets when they come back. The question is whether to confront them where they are now by military force or wait until they return home and rely on diligent intelligence work to identify them before they strike. But without direct American involvement we will need to rely on arming Kurdish forces to lead the assault on ISIS” (Telegraph View, 2014).

In 2012, London hosted the successful Olympic and Paralympic Games, David Cameron highlighted the global need for fair taxes, increased transparency and open trade. In particular, David Cameron advocated the idea that too many people are held back in poverty because of corruption, rotten government, and lack of access to justice.

In 2014, David Cameron promoted another country of the United Kingdom, by chairing the NATO Summit at Celtic Manor in Wales. UK also was committed to the NATO by 2 % defense spending target, as well as it stood up for the world's poorest by giving 0.7 % aid and development spending. (Jonathan, 2014)

In the same year, Cameron won the Scottish referendum; he ensured to Scotland, that it would stay part of the United Kingdom. However, in June 2016; David Cameron argued that Britain was stronger, safer and better off inside the European Union, but the British people voted to leave the EU. This pushed David Cameron to resign as Prime Minister and Leader of the Conservative Party, leaving 10 Downing Street<sup>2</sup> on 13 July 2016. In September 2016, he resigned as a Member of Parliament, leaving politics. (BBC News: 2016)

## **2. Cameron's Foreign Policy in the EU**

For almost all intents and purposes, the State acts for the society internationally and governments make policy in the name of the State under external, domestic, institutional, and other pressures.

However, in all states, to a greater or lesser degree, foreign policy emerges out of an institutional process and in most cases, it is extremely rare for foreign policy decisions to be the responsibility of a single individual or a small group. The need for information, interpretation, and advice, and the necessity for coordinating policies between different areas

---

<sup>2</sup> Colloquially known in the United Kingdom as Number 10, is the headquarters of the Government of the United Kingdom and the official residence and office of the First Lord of the Treasury,

and different ministries involve a large number of men and agencies in the evolution of policy. Foreign policy is therefore made within an organizational context consisting of many agencies. (Kebele-Kale)

Cameroon's foreign policy has been shaped by a variety of factors, which have been always linked to the central of its domestic structure including all of the national economy, national resource base, governmental structure, and the political leadership. The other domestic factors are the country's network of alliances, its colonial heritage, its size and its location.

Throughout his leadership Cameron always looked forward to make his county progressed, and safer; and for him being a part of the EU is what confirmed it. In 2013 Cameron made a commitment to renegotiate a better settlement for the UK's membership in the EU and hold an in or out EU referendum; however, the British citizens saw that they would be better without the EU and voted to be out for the EU. This let Cameron to resign in March 2017.

All the visions saw that Britain would not leave the EU and the EU in particular trusted that Britain would not leave the union. Thus, the decision of Britain was to leave the union which shocked both the Prime Minister David Cameron and the EU.

In February 2016, the UK's membership of the EU was re-negotiated, and as Cameron promised in the election manifesto, he gave the citizens the choice to stay or leave the EU, declaring that his companion would be to remain. This referendum came to be known as Brexit, a portmanteau of "British" and "exit".

Britain was divided into two parts, the first was the remaining companion under the motto "Britain Stronger in Europe"; they explained the economic risks that the citizen would

face, if they left the union. They also attempted to predict how much poorer they would be in the event of Brexit failed to resonate with voters. Charles Grant<sup>3</sup> claimed in his post-referendum analysis that: “many Britons wanted to find out how their country could lead the EU if it stayed, rather than what would happen to its economy if it left” (Brady 4).

The other side was the leaving under the motto “vote to leave”, they focused on the emigration rather than economic because they knew the difficulties they had to face changing all the data. Boris Johnson<sup>4</sup> and other Brexiteers argued that: “only by voting to leave the EU would Britain be able to liberate itself from (allegedly) onerous EU regulations, and gain control of its migration policy”. (06)

Media also had a great role in shaping peoples’ ideas, the British tabloids rejected Cameron reform, while the broad cast media had also an influence like the BBC (British Broadcasting Channel), which tried to expose the EU. On the other hand; there was the liberal party leader Jeremy Corbyn, who did not watch in silent and put all his efforts to defeat Cameron and win the war.

Cameron hoped that the referendum would make an end to his obsession with the EU, imagining that he could win the vote and put the question of British EU membership to bed. But this was just a dream for which Cameron paid a high price. After the results of the referendum had been announced he resigned as leader of the Conservative Party and prime minister as well.

---

<sup>3</sup> A British politician influential in Indian and domestic affairs.

<sup>4</sup> A British politician, popular historian and journalist.

**Conclusion**

David Cameron, the son of the wealthy family had several roles on the political side in Britain; he was a Member of the Parliament, a conservative leader, and a Prime Minister. However, his policy in leading brought changes namely in all the fields; the most remarkable one was his political interfering in the affairs of other countries. However, Cameron's interventionism was mostly linked to Blair's. The latter issue will be discussed in the third chapter.

# CHAPTER THREE:

# CAMERON'S

# INTERVENTIONISM

## **Introduction**

In the previous chapter, a review of both personal and professional life of the Prime Minister David Cameron were highlighted, focusing on his foreign policy in the EU. This part will shed light on the foreign policy from the time of Tony Blair. This chapter, thus, seeks to compare and contrast between the conditions of intervention policy among both Prime Ministers, Blair and Cameron through their ministership in order to explain the similarities with vital differences between the two leaders' thinking on intervention, with particular reference to Cameron's perception, and military operations in Middle East and Libya.

## 1. From Liberal Interventionism to Liberal Conservatism

Close observers of British foreign policy usually remark on how rare it is to find sudden or unexpected foreign policy ruptures brought about either by a change of Prime Minister leading the same majority government, or following a change in the main party of government itself (Theakston 2004).

From the time of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s, it has been difficult to engender anything more than 'marginal rather than decisive' and break up with past tradition. Similarly was Blair with all his achievements, failure and all of his domestic and foreign policy were clearly followed by public and commentators; and that he gave a great interest to policy overseas. Thus, when it came to Gordon Brown between 2007 and 2010, he focused much on the domestic affairs maybe due to his role as Chancellor of the Exchequer between 1997 and 2007.

On May 2010, David Cameron came to Ministership due to an uneasy alliance between his own Conservative Party and the Liberal Democrats rather than an electoral triumph. At that time, the Conservative Party and their foreign secretary William Hague, dominated this policy field. On the other hand, the liberal party had just a few successors to the government, which made the conservative party the dominant one.

'Liberal Conservatism' was the new term used by both David Cameron and the conservative foreign policy William Hague to describe their new approach, which has been a response to 'liberal interventionism'. It is argued that both Brown and Cameron learnt several lessons from the foreign policy terms of Blair. Yet, Cameron's role was somewhat reduced by giving the House of Commons the role to vote on military actions. Blair's departure was not official as though some real changes took place within the political scene, some issues continued to be there as a reflection of his policy, making Cameron a successor of Blair.

William Hague dated back this change of foreign policy to the Damascus style vision of the Labour Party since 1997, at the same time emphasizing the 'ethical dimensions to foreign policy'. Instead, he argued that "very little had changed in real terms in foreign policy over the period of the Blair government for either the Labour or Conservative parties, describing the traditional approach of the Conservative Party as enlightened self-interest", implying that "this approach was continuing under Cameron's leadership... It is not in our character to have a foreign policy without a conscience: to be idle or uninterested while others starve or murder each other in their millions is not for use" (2009).

## **2. The Blair Legacy**

Blair was well-known by his Doctrine of the International Community. In this doctrine, the previous Prime Minister outlined six main principles, indicating a vision for the British foreign policy in the future, and highlighting the centrality of the Prime Minister when taking any decision about foreign policy.

In one of his speeches, Blair said, "acts of genocide can never be a purely internal matter" (PBS online 1999). In these words, he insisted that interventionism was and is first of all based upon human rights. In other words, it seeks the protection of those who would struggle to protect themselves. These emotional words could touch several hearts, though the aim beyond this soft speech was to encourage America to support Britain, when it comes to overseas danger.

This issue was clearly adopted by Oliver Daddow, who argues that the whole Chicago speech was "devised behind the Foreign Office's back, as one of the key contributors to the speech that Lawrence Freedman, a professor of war studies and a member in the Iraq inquiry, has testified" (556). For Daddow, this speech used the ethics and human rights to justify military

action and to keep America from returning to an isolationist position. Freedman also agreed with him as he stated that, "this was a way of saying something that was distinctively Blairy".

Thus, for scholars Dodds and Elden, Blair's foreign policy was 'a form of idealism moderated by realism' (359). This means Blair connected idealism to realism to form a different foreign policy, and when it comes to the ethical dimension, it was for the British aims, like the war in Kosovo. However, Blair's attention to the Iraqi war was not ethical but realist, as he wanted to force compliance of a UN mandate; but "The Desert Fox campaign demonstrates that the 9/11 bombings did not derail the moral crusade of Blair, pushing him into a more realist and aggressive foreign policy" (Seldon, 2005).

Since 1998, Blair was adopting a realist approach when dealing with Iraq, which confirms that the ethical dimensions and human rights were not the primary driving force of British foreign policy.

### **3. The Brown Government**

Unlike Blair's premiership who strode the world stage, Gordon Brown's policy was limited to a domestic one. Thus, he played a great role in governments, as everything was put on him concerning foreign or domestic affairs; as well as it has been seen that his interest in economy was a personal issue, which may be the reason beyond lifting the foreign policy. Yet, Seldon and Lodge come to bring a different reason as they suggest that by doing so, Brown's aim was to be a different leader from Blair.

Brown was determined to show that he, not Blair, was effectively in charge of the government. If he did not win every new battle against Blair, he descended into a terrible rage. The Treasury was effectively run by a small cabal from the Chancellor's office, consisting of Brown, Balls and a tight group of officials and aids, including Whelan and Ed Miliband (2011).

Whitman noted that 'Brown was complicit in the key foreign policy decisions of Blair's tenure as Prime Minister' (Whitman, 836); while Robin Cook argues that Brown supported Blair by supporting the war in Iraq, Cook wrote in his diary "Brown's experiences in Blair's government shaped his own views and the priorities which he had when he became Prime Minister himself. Rather a poisoned legacy in foreign policy terms, but not one he could easily back away from". (Cook, 2003)

Even after becoming a Prime Minister, Brown thought that the war in Iraq did not change a bit, as he answered that everything that was happening was right. In a journal interview, Brown was asked about his view concerning war in Iraq, he stated: "everything Mr Blair did, he did properly and I was kept fully informed about the information that I needed to make my decisions' (BBC News 2010).

Brown did not outline any doctrine and instead of being Prime Minister, he just accepted the legacy of Blair like working on the project of Blair, which was developing an aid agenda. Unfortunately, Brown's Premiership which lasts for three years, did not achieve much as his room for manoeuvre was further attacked by terrorist, the Foot and Mouth crisis<sup>1</sup> followed by the financial crisis in 2008; as well as Brown had little time and money to deal with conflicts far away from British shores.

Vickers summarized Brown's Premiership stating that: "Brown's time in government was like in foreign policy as well as domestic terms, shaped by events as well as the actions of the Blair government; but that was Brown's legacy as well as Blair's. He may have been buffeted by the political weather, but it was weather he had helped to create" (2011).

---

<sup>1</sup> an infectious and sometimes fatal viral disease that affects cloven-hoofed animals,

#### 4. Cameron's Ministership

Prime Minister David Cameron was considered as the critic of the previous minister Tony Blair namely when it comes to the international community. However, the timing of each intervention was legacy forming as well as crucial. On the one hand, Blair brought, in his doctrine, the attention of international community, thus the case of Kosovo changed everything. On the other hand, Cameron's dilemma was even more than Blair's, as he was in between a militarily intervene in an Arab country and the economic difficulty back home which required a cut in the defense budget.

However; the Conservative leadership in his first steps followed Blair's lead in announcing their own doctrine labelled 'Liberal Conservatism', where Cameron announced

I am a Liberal Conservative. Liberal, because I believe in the freedom of individuals to pursue their own happiness, with the minimum of interference from government. Sceptical of the state, trusting people to make the most of their lives, confident about the possibilities of the future – this is liberalism. And Conservative, because I believe that we're all in this together – that there is a historical understanding between past, present and future generations, and that we have a social responsibility to play an active part in the community we live in (Cameron 2007).

Thus, liberal conservatism is not considered as an ideology; but a set of issues in a term foreign policy, mainly consisted of five main principles, as shown below:

- That we should understand fully the threat we face
- That democracy cannot quickly be imposed from outside
- That our strategy needs to go far beyond military action
- That we need a new multilateralism to tackle the new global challenges we face

- That we must strive to act with moral authority (Guardian, 2006)

Historically, in terms of foreign policy, a certain degree of continuity between the main political parties has been assumed, the foreign policy was defined as the big prize, and all the eyes were waiting on fire for the person who would take the lion share.

#### **4.1 Interventionism in the World**

‘I may not have succeeded in halting the war, but I did secure the right of parliament to decide on war’ (Cook, 190). With these words, Cameron gave the British parliament the green light to decide when Britain should go to war.

This authority gave parliament the power to rule and define wars overseas, which was an issue suggested by several MP and ministers as they saw that there was "a new ‘*parliamentary prerogative*’ governing the use of force overseas that sits alongside and qualifies the legal position. A future parliament, differently comprised, may yet decide to give this power up" (Bogdanor 224).

The House of Commons votes over Iraq in 2003 and Libya in 2011; in 2013 Cameron had to obey this command. This remarks that the UK House of Commons delivered a historic defeat to a Prime Minister, and a government on a matter of military policy.

##### **4.1.1 Action in Iraq**

In 19 March 2003 Tony Blair made a commitment to GW Bush that Britain would join at attack on Iraq. But back home he was weighed down by Labour Party opposition. Blair had the opportunity to go to war without parliamentary or public support, but this would lose him legitimacy; so he offered MP to vote, and since no decision was taken, Blair refused war over Iraq.

Both Gordon Brown and David Cameron supported a stronger parliamentary role, but once in the office none of them took real step to make his promise in real. However, Cameron couldn't escape from the fact that parliament has a great role and finally MP became the boss concerning foreign policy. Soon after they decided war in Iraq and Cameron had to do something just to make that wish true; and that what was happened in 2013.

Chilcot in his Report untitled "the Iraq War was a mistake or wrong" made it a clear that there was no need for a war over Iraq as there was no threat from Saddam Hussein and there was a possibility of a peaceful resolution. The Conservative MP John Baron was asked: "Will the Prime Minister now do something that no government has done since 2003? He said "That is, finally and unequivocally, admit that this intervention was both wrong and a mistake." Yet Cameron replied: "I think people should read the report and come to their own conclusion. Clearly the aftermath of this conflict was profoundly disastrous in so many ways. I don't move away from that all." Adding: "I think anyone who voted for the conflict has to take their share of responsibility. I don't choose to go back and say 'if I knew then what I know now' and all the rest of it. .... I just think you make a decision, you defend it at the time, and then you have to live with the consequences and bear your share of responsibility." (Jon Stone, 2016)

#### **4.1.2 Actions in Libya**

Libya can be considered as an old enemy back to the relationship between Blair and Gaddafi, which wasn't an easy one; as the British Prime Minister brought Libya into the fold of the international community in 2004.

Though; the Arabian country was returning to the international community, Gaddafi was still seeing as a threat together with the considerable issue that was the Lockerbie bombing

and the bomber and the releasing Abdelbaset al-Megrahi<sup>2</sup> from the Scottish jail by humanitarian grounds.

Libya was regarded as a danger especially for European nations due to its proximity to the southern coast of Europe. So by returning to the international community, it reduced the nation's ability to develop nuclear technology further, which would also benefit the global community, on the other hand, it enabled Blair to demonstrate his foreign policy credentials in a more peaceful way.

After that Libya did not become a large supplier of oil to Britain, Leech and Gaskarth commented on that saying: "British security and intelligence relations in this period [during Blair's term in office] later proved highly controversial following allegations that Britain had shared intelligence and co-operated with operations that led to the rendition of individuals to Libya and their subsequent torture" (Leech and Gaskarth 146)

Cameron minister ship was paralleled with the swept of the Arab Spring across the Middle East and the conflict with Libya; this was a test to see if Cameron had learned from Iraq war, and several historians agree that he did better this time. The prime minister this time chose another path which was somehow surprising as he responded to Gaddafi's violent attacks on the rebels.

This surprising change in the rules of the game was not for the benefits of Libya. This country perfect geographical location, on the northern coast of Africa, made it easy for NATO nations to reach it from European bases place; while it made the key NATO members like the US, UK and France, to demonstrate their limited willingness to support the Arab Spring and

---

<sup>2</sup> a Libyan who was head of security for Libyan Arab Airlines, director of the Centre for Strategic Studies in Tripoli, Libya, and an alleged Libyan intelligence officer.

protect human rights and protect their own interests. The weather conditions also were provided the right atmosphere for bombing raids.

Moreover, Al Gaddafi was considered as an erratic leader, who have more enemies than friend; who made Libya an easy target to the military action and could provide Cameron government a useful platform in order to demonstrate their Liberal Conservatism.

Daddow highlighted these issue explaining that "Cameron has been at pains to inform the watching public that Libya will not mark for him a step on the same dangerous path of democracy promotion through the use of force that characterized the post-11 September Blair era" (Daddow, 114); adding that this was a wish to the liberal conservatism " Conservative Party have always looked to global organizations for support and this return to essentials was a result of Cameron's obvious intention to distance himself from Blair, as the Conservative Party sought in turn to distance itself from New Labour's perceived recklessness in foreign policy" (332)

#### **4.1.3 Actions in Syria**

Syria the previous French colony was considered as a successful region, though it has some religious problem. The Syrian leader, Bashar al-Assad who succeeded his father in 2000, was considered as the liberal face of the Middle East; as he was flattered by the Western culture as his wife Asma was British born and education, Zisser pointed out that "al-Assad image was of a reformer, of a man of the world familiar with Western ways and views" (Zisser, 17).

Thus, some stories began to spread about government violence against its people and human right abuses; which pushed Cameron, the British Prime Minister, to take political and military actions against what was happening. Thus war with Syria meant war with Russia, as the latter had parts of the Syrian coastline together with trading links with the nation;

furthermore, it would add more difficult relations between Russia and the Western Nations (the US, UK and France).

As with Libya David Cameron saw that the human rights violations warranted military action, Strong argues that Cameron "felt constrained... to follow past practice, and in the process surrendered control over his own foreign policy" (Strong 14). Yet this wasn't Cameron decision to be taken by himself, thus the House of Commons also voted against action in Syria by 285 to 272, which prevented the UK from joining US-led strikes in Syria (BBC, 2013). This vote was seen as a defeat of government's foreign policy as the decision was put to the house of common, which essentially confirmed that the government was not in control of their own foreign policy in some cases. The international community and the domestic electorate had noted several things about the absence of military actions in Syria.

Parliament is expected to be more engaged in foreign policy action, Strong pointed on "the increasing necessity of a Commons vote on military action, precipitated by Blair's Iraq vote... while the prime minister retains the legal freedom to direct the armed forces as he sees fit, in terms of practice parliament now wields a political veto over that freedom" (Strong, 14).

The actions in Syria wasn't something to be voted on, it was a case of war that needs to be made more vocally and more widely; as a lack of domestic support would made military action very difficult. Hennessey regarded that "the case for a public legal opinion is made thus the case for war needed to be made to the public and that the conclusions of the Joint Intelligence Committee should be separated from the opinion of the Prime Minister (Hennessey, 347).

**Conclusion**

The legacy of the Prime Minister Tony Blair has been taken and preceded by both Brown and Cameron. Brown was mainly working on the domestic affairs, while Cameron had more concerns and actions towards the foreign policy. However, power was limited by the House of Commons. This affected his decision about foreign policy affairs; however, the actions in Iraq were considered as Cameron mistake, though it was not his own fault. Yet, that was a lesson which helped Cameron to deal with both Libya and Syria.

## General Conclusion

The British history is rich of events and changes, as each king or queen has his own way in ruling; and each prime minister has his own touch when it comes to Britain itself or the world. The youngest prime minister and number ten when it comes to Ministership was David Cameron. During his leadership, as a conservative leader or prime minister; Britain saw ups and downs in both domestic and foreign affairs, due to the fact each positive shift has a negative side. Though, Cameronism was likely to be regarded as a progress of Blairism, he had his own policy, his own ways and created his own party, the liberal conservative.

Throughout the twentieth century Britain had focused on its relationship with America more than other relations with the world. The Anglo-American relationship was a close friendship. Both the US and UK's cooperation has persisted in the international security and defense. All of the prime ministers including Cameron respected and insisted that this relation stays, as it is "real and tangible".

When it comes to Europe, the British membership in the EU was a factor of implementing the national interests of its foreign policy, and influenced positively on the British prosperity. Thus, the British citizen saw that they would be better without this union, neglecting Cameron's words that they are safer and progressed in the EU.

In the other half of the century, the world witnessed a revolution in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya, and the civil uprisings in other countries like Bahrain, Syria, and Yemen rose and were referred to as the Arab Spring. This was a challenge for the foreign and security policies, which led Britain to be involved under the so called human rights.

Though any involvement was not that of Cameron's decision, as the House of Commons had controls everything. Thus; the attack on Iraq which was considered as

Cameron's foolish mistake, was not his own decision and the blame should be shared with the MP as well. However, when it comes to the actions in both Libya and Syria; the one can see that Cameron learned the lesson and did not have any military involvement with the two Arab countries. Though, Cameron's reason was human right, it is clear that both countries remarked a real danger for both Britain and the European nation.

To sum up, one cannot neglect the fact that Cameron brought a change to Britain's economy, as he led Britain in a period when it was not at its high power. He also helped getting strong relationships with America, Europe and the world, by changing his policy of intervention from liberal interventionism to liberal conservatism.

## Works Cited

- Blair, Tony, *Speech by the Prime Minister at the Lord Mayor's Banquet* (10 November 1997),
- Burk, Kathleen, *Old World, New World: The Story of Britain and America* (London: Little, Brown, 2007).
- Daddow, O. & Gaskarth, J. *British Foreign Policy: The new Labour Years*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. 2011. Print
- Eurobarometer report (2007). Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/eb/eb67/eb67\\_uk\\_nat.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb67/eb67_uk_nat.pdf). Accessed on May 24<sup>th</sup> 2018.
- Eurobarometer report (2008). Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/public\\_opinion/archives/eb/eb70/eb70\\_first\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/eb/eb70/eb70_first_en.pdf). Accessed on May 24<sup>th</sup> 2018.
- Foreign Affairs Committee, "British-US Relations," Response of the Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, Second Report, (The Stationery Office: 2002).
- Heffernan, R. "Prime ministerial predominance? Core executive politics in the UK." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. Vol. 5, No.3. pp. 347-362. 2003. Print.
- Hill, Christopher. *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. Routledge. London. 2002. Print.
- Lehmkuhl, Ursula. "Still Special! Anglo-American Relations since the End of the Cold War." in: Oppermann, Kai (ed). *British Foreign and Security Policy: Historical Legacies and Current Challenges*. (Augsburg: Wißner Verlag, 2012), 13-30.
- Lunn, J., Miller V., Smith B. "British foreign policy since 1997." *Library Research Paper* 08/56. 2008. Available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rp2008/rp08-056.pdf>.

- O'Malley, E. "Setting Choices, Controlling Outcomes: The Operation of Prime Ministerial Influence and The UK's Decision to Invade Iraq". *Journal of Politics and International Relations*. Vol. 9. pp.1-9. 2007.
- Prišmantaitė K. "British foreign policy in the 21st century: priorities and challenges". *Global Academic Society Journal: Social Science Insight*, Vol. 2, No. 7, pp. 41-54. 2009. Print.
- Reynolds, David, "Anglo-American Relations since 1607: Three Historical Paradigms, " in: Lehmkuhl, Ursula and Schmidt, Gustav (eds.), *From Enmity to Friendship: Anglo-American Relations in the 19th and 20th century*. Augsburg: WißnerVerlag. pp.13-27. 2005.
- Reynolds, David, "The Special Relationship: Rethinking Anglo-American Relations," *International Affairs* 65, 1. 89-111.1989. Print.
- Runciman, David, *The Politics of Good Intentions: History, Fear, and Hypocrisy in the New World Order*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 2006.
- Straw, J. "Britain's priorities in Europe." Opening Speech By The Foreign Secretary, Jack Straw, At The Pre-European Council Debate, House Of Commons, London. 2003. Available at: [http://www.iepberlin.de/fileadmin/website/03\\_Forschung/Verfassung/Straw\\_Unterhaus10122003.pdf](http://www.iepberlin.de/fileadmin/website/03_Forschung/Verfassung/Straw_Unterhaus10122003.pdf)
- The Economist, "An Interview with David Cameron: The Transcript of our Chat with the Conservative Leader," 31 March 2010, available at: [http://www.economist.com/node/15814344?story\\_id=15814344](http://www.economist.com/node/15814344?story_id=15814344) Accessed on May 24<sup>th</sup> 2018.
- UK International Priorities: A Strategy for the FCO. Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The Stationery Office. 2003.