

## **ABSTRACT**

JULIE PATEL

A Study of the Individual Factors that Influence the Voting Practices of Members of the United Kingdom House of Commons on Legislation Regarding the Use of Force  
Under the Direction of Dr. Patricia Sullivan

The role that individuals have had in international relations are important in understanding the nature and outcome of military interventions conducted by state powers. This study will focus solely on the state power of the United Kingdom and its House of Commons in the post-Cold War setting. While there has been previous research done on the voting behavior of the political elite of the United States, this study will focus on a greater number of factors like gender, party membership of the Members of Parliament (MPs), as well as the previous military experience of MPs. These factors will be studied to see how they impacted the MPs' voting practices when it came to issues of the use of force by the state. In order to conduct the study, research will be done on all House of Commons sessions and its members since 1991. To investigate the three factors, I will review the voting records of MPs from 1991 to see how they voted, as well as reviewing their biographies and profiles. The voting records and the three factors will be studied together to see if and how they influenced the voting practices of MPs. The primary purpose of the research is to show how focusing on individuals helps to provide a better overall understanding of how and why a military intervention is conducted by a major power and how it is ended.

**INDEX WORDS:** United Kingdom, House of Commons, Military Interventions, Outcome, Gender, Military Experience, Party Membership, Use of Force, Voting

A STUDY OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE VOTING  
PRACTICES OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM HOUSE OF COMMONS ON  
LEGISLATION REGARDING THE USE OF FORCE

by

JULIE PATEL

A Thesis Submitted to the Honors Council of the University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree

BACHELOR OF ARTS

in INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

with HIGHEST HONORS

and CURO SCHOLAR DISTINCTION

Athens, Georgia

2009

© 2009

Julie Patel

All Rights Reserved

A STUDY OF THE INDIVIDUAL FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE VOTING  
PRACTICES OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM HOUSE OF COMMONS ON  
LEGISLATION REGARDING THE USE OF FORCE

by

JULIE PATEL

Approved:

Patricia Sullivan

July 28, 2009

---

Dr. Patricia Sullivan  
Faculty Research Mentor

---

Date

Approved:

Brock Tessman

July 28, 2009

---

Dr. Brock Tessman  
Reader

---

Date

Approved:

David S. Williams

July 31, 2009

---

Dr. David S. Williams  
Director, Honors Program, Foundation Fellows and  
Center for Undergraduate Research Opportunities

---

Date

Approved:

Pamela B. Kleiber

July 31, 2009

---

Dr. Pamela B. Kleiber  
Associate Director, Honors Program and  
Center for Undergraduate Research Opportunities

---

Date

## DEDICATION

To my parents- for all the love, support, and encouragement they have given me.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my faculty mentor Dr. Patricia Sullivan and faculty reader Dr. Brock Tessman. Their advice on the project was invaluable and very much appreciated.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTERS	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 UNITED KINGDOM PARLIAMENT.....	4
3 GENDER.....	9
4 MILITARY EXPERIENCE.....	14
5 POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION.....	19
6 VOTING LEGISLATION.....	23
7 METHODOLOGY.....	29
8 RESULTS.....	43
9 CONCLUSION.....	49
WORKS CITED.....	57

## LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Observed and Expected Votes: Vote 1.....	36
Table 1.1: Gender	
Table 1.2: Military Experience	
Table 1.3: Political Party	
Table 2: Observed and Expected Votes: Vote 2.....	37
Table 2.1: Gender	
Table 2.2: Military Experience	
Table 2.3: Political Party	
Table 3: Observed and Expected Votes: Vote 3.....	37
Table 3.1: Gender	
Table 3.2: Military Experience	
Table 3.3: Political Party	
Table 4: Observed and Expected Votes: Vote 4.....	38
Table 4.1: Gender	
Table 4.2: Military Experience	
Table 4.3: Political Party	
Table 5: Observed and Expected Votes: Vote 5.....	38
Table 5.1: Gender	
Table 5.2: Military Experience	



Table 5.3: Political Party

Table 6: Critical Values at 2 Degrees of Freedom.....	39
Table 7: Critical Values at 4 Degrees of Freedom.....	39
Table 8: Test Statistics and P-Values.....	40
Table 9: Observed and Expected Aggregate Sum of Votes in Support and Opposition of the Use of Force .....	41
Table 10: Aggregate Test Statistic Values and P-Values.....	42
Table 11: Aggregate Percentages.....	42

## CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

The presence of interstate conflict and the use of force throughout history has long since been a point of interest and fascination among social scientists. In fact, since the end of World War II, many scholars and researchers have worked towards developing a unifying theory that would help to explain why states in the global system choose to initiate the use of military force. However, despite all of the extensive research done by social scientists, there still has not been much success in discovering a “grand theory,”<sup>1</sup> that identifies a single root cause of war among states or why states choose to initiate force. Social scientists have, instead, found “it useful to distinguish between levels of analysis”<sup>2</sup> when trying to understand the cause or causes of an interstate conflict in which military force is used. Overall, there are six levels of analysis that can be studied, either separately or simultaneously: individual decision makers, the roles of decision makers, governmental structure, the characteristics of the society, international relations, and the world system. Each of these levels of analysis provides a different perspective and helps to create a clearer picture for understanding the cause of interstate conflict and the use of force by states operating in the global system.

The focus of this thesis will be on studying the role of individual decision makers in the United Kingdom House of Commons in the post-Cold War era. Different characteristics of the individual decision makers will be studied to see if and how they have influenced the decision to initiate and continue the use of force in interstate conflicts in which the United Kingdom is a

---

<sup>1</sup> Cashman, Greg and Robinson, Leonard C. *An Introduction to the Causes of War*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2007. Pg. 3

<sup>2</sup> Russett, Bruce et al. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Thomas Wadsworth Publishing. 2006. Pg. 13

participating state. Individuals play an important role in the cause of war. In fact, Greg Cashman and Leonard C. Robinson wrote a textbook entitled *An Introduction to the Causes of War*, in which they discuss and analyze how individuals have impacted the initiation of the use of force in six interstate conflicts including World War I, the Six Day War, and the Iran-Iraq War. While at times the impact of individuals on certain foreign policy decisions may not always be obvious, it is highly unlikely that leaders of a state are not involved in the decision making process to go to war. Additionally, it is not only the top leaders involved in the decision making process.<sup>3</sup> As it will be later discussed in the thesis, the members of the House of Commons play an important role in the initiation of the use of force by the United Kingdom, which is why they were chosen for this project to study at the individual level of analysis.

In chapter two of this thesis, an overview of the United Kingdom Parliament will be given in order to gain a better understanding of the government structure. Additionally, an explanation as to why this particular government structure was chosen for this study will be given. The third chapter will discuss the first of the chosen three individual characteristics: gender of members of Parliament in the House of Commons. There has been previous research conducted as well as opinion polls by Gallup done to see how gender influences foreign policy decisions. The results from these studies have indicated that there is a gender gap, which shows that men and women approach foreign policy issues and concerns differently. There are two distinct reasons for the existence of the gender gap, both of which will be covered in chapter three. In chapter four, the role of previous military experience of MPs will be studied. Scholars like Samuel Huntington, Christopher Gelpi, and Peter Feaver have all researched the concept of military conservatism. Their work indicates that those who have served in the armed forces view

---

<sup>3</sup> Hudson, Valerie M. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2007. Pg. 37-38

the decision making process for the initiation and continuation of the use of force differently than their civilian counterparts. Those who are veterans are seen to be more cautious when it comes to initiating the use of force because they understand the true costs involved when fighting in a war. The concept of military conservatism will be further discussed in chapter four.

In chapter five, the characteristic of political party affiliation of members of the House of Commons will be studied. There are two leading parties in the United Kingdom, the Labour Party and Conservative Party. Both the Labour and Conservative ideologies will be further studied along with the parallels drawn between the United States and the United Kingdom political party systems. Additionally, chapters three through five will also provide the hypotheses that are to be tested based on the information researched. The sixth chapter will provide a summary of all of the legislative votes in the House of Commons that deal with the initiation and the continuation of the use of force by the United Kingdom. Chapter seven will discuss the methodology used to test the hypotheses stated in chapters three through five. The results of the calculations made will be stated in chapter eight. The ninth and final chapter of this thesis will be the conclusion in which the results gathered through calculations are further explained. Additionally, the limitations and obstacles of the research project will be addressed in the conclusion as well as other future avenues of research.

## CHAPTER TWO UNITED KINGDOM PARLIAMENT

Before going any further into this thesis, it is first important to understand why the United Kingdom Parliament, or more specifically, the House of Commons was chosen for studying the cause of interstate conflict in the post-Cold War era at the individual level of analysis. The following chapter will give a thorough background about the United Kingdom government structure and will reveal why it was the ideal choice to study at the individual level of analysis for the initiation and continuation of the use of force.

### *Background*

First and foremost, the United Kingdom operates under a democratic system, in which “political power is exercised either directly or indirectly through participation, competition, and liberty.”<sup>4</sup> There are three branches of government in the United Kingdom: the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The executive branch of the government is comprised of the head of state, head of government, and the Cabinet. The head, or chief, of state basically fulfills the role of being a symbol or representative of the people of the state internationally. In the United Kingdom the head of the state is currently the reigning monarch, Queen Elizabeth II. The head of the government on the other hand is responsible for the everyday tasks associated with running the state. Currently, Prime Minister Gordon Brown fulfills the role of the head of the government, as he is the leader of the Labour Party, which is the governing and majority party in Parliament.

---

<sup>4</sup> O’Neil, Patrick. *Essentials of Comparative Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Second Edition. 2007. Pg 135

The legislative branch of the United Kingdom, which is also known as Parliament, is bicameral and made up of the following two houses: the House of Commons and House of Lords. Traditionally, Parliament has been brought into session upon being summoned by the sovereign. The Queen makes a speech at the beginning of each new session of Parliament, and “promises various ‘bills,’ ‘legislation,’ ‘measures,’ items for ‘discussion,’ and ‘proposals.’”<sup>5</sup> This speech made to Parliament basically sets the agenda and goals for both houses for the new session.

The House of Commons is comprised of Members of Parliament, or MPs. The MPs are elected into office by popular vote. The officials each represent a single constituency in the United Kingdom. The exact number of elected MPs varies depending on Boundary Commission reviews, but the approximate number is 650 MPs in the House of Commons. General elections are held to fill the seats in the House of Commons at a regular interval, and the political party that has the majority establishes a new Government, which currently is the Labour Party in the United Kingdom. The Conservative Party has established the alternative or shadow government, in the House of Commons. “The existence of the opposition reminds the public that there is an alternative government with an alternative ‘Shadow Cabinet’ and policies.”<sup>6</sup> Once a new Government is established, “Parliament may last up to five years, normally divided into annual sessions....A Parliament ends by dissolution, either by will of the sovereign or by lapse of the five year period.”<sup>7</sup>

The purpose of the House of Commons has evolved since its creation in 1295 A.D., and over time the relationship the House of Commons has had with the Crown has changed gradually

---

<sup>5</sup> Kavanagh, Dennis, et al. *British Politics*. Oxford University Press. Fifth Edition. 2006. Pg. 377

<sup>6</sup> Ibid. Pg. 382

<sup>7</sup> Turner, Barry. *The Statesman's Yearbook 2009: The Politics, Cultures, and Economies of the World*. Macmillian Publishers. 2008. Pg 1273

as well. More and more, the House of Commons has been able to attain a greater level of power and control. The House of Commons plays a large role today in the law making process of the United Kingdom. Despite the fact that Parliament as a whole has supreme legislative power in the United Kingdom, it should be noted that much of the legislative power has transferred over to the House of Commons.

The House of Lords, on the other hand, serves as the upper house in the United Kingdom Parliament. It is comprised of peers and high-ranking members of the clergy. In total, there are 500 life peers, 92 hereditary peers, and 26 clergy. There are no elections in this house like in the House of Commons. The only time elections are held in the House of Lords is when there is a vacancy among the 92 hereditary peers. The life peers, on the other hand, are appointed to their position by the House of Lords Appointments Commissions. While the House of Lords is involved in the legislative process of making law, it also plays a role in the judicial branch. The House of Lords acts as the final court of appeals for civil and criminal cases. “Up to 12 law lords sit in the Lords- [and] their main work lies not in debates but judging cases in the highest appeals court in the UK.”<sup>8</sup>

### *Military Defense of the United Kingdom*

The focus of this thesis is on the use of force conducted by the United Kingdom armed forces in the post-Cold War era. Therefore, it is important to understand how the United Kingdom controls its armed forces. The military defense of the United Kingdom falls under the purview of the Defense Council. The Defense Council was first established on April 1, 1914, “under the chairmanship of the Secretary of State for Defense [Cabinet member], who is

---

<sup>8</sup> “Guide to peers and House of Lords.” BBC News. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk\\_news/politics/4828094.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4828094.stm)

responsible to the Sovereign and Parliament for the defense of the realm.”<sup>9</sup> The Council is able to command the armed forces of the United Kingdom as well as make decisions on defense policy. “Important matters of policy are considered by the full Cabinet or, more frequently by the Defense and Overseas Policy Committee under the chairmanship of the Prime Minister.”<sup>10</sup> The Defense Council and the Cabinet, whose members are drawn from the House of Commons, are able to make decisions when it comes to initiating the use of force. Furthermore, the Defense Council and the Cabinet have the authority to deploy troops and give orders abroad to military personnel “and Parliament need not give its approval.”<sup>11</sup> It is normal for the Government to keep Parliament apprised and well informed of the decision to use force. However, ultimately, the Defense Council is held responsible to Parliament for the decisions that they make when it comes to initiating and continuing the use of military force in a conflict.

There are two reasons as to why the United Kingdom House of Commons in Parliament was chosen for this thesis. The first reason is because of the commonalities between the government structure of the United States and the United Kingdom. For one thing, the executive branches of both governments have the authority to control the use of military force. However, ultimately both states’ executive branches are held liable and responsible to the United States Congress and the United Kingdom Parliament, respectively. Additionally, it is the legislative branches of both governments that are allowed to officially declare war.

The second reason the United Kingdom was chosen was that it presents an ideal situation for studying the cause of war at the individual level of analysis. In the United Kingdom House of Commons, MPs vote on all matters and issues of legislation presented to the floor.

---

<sup>9</sup> Turner, Barry. *The Statesman’s Yearbook 2009: The Politics, Cultures, and Economies of the World*. Macmillian Publishers. 2008. Pg 1278

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. Pg 1278

<sup>11</sup> Bowers, Paul. “Parliament and the use of force.”

<http://www.parliament.uk/documents/upload/snja-01218.pdf>. (PDF file) Standard Note. Feb. 25, 2003



Traditionally, MPs have voted along the party lines and how the party whips tell them to, unless a free vote has been declared. A free vote is when MPs do not receive instructions from party whips and can vote as they wish to. Even though there has been a list of free votes established, it is not a complete list. Due to the confidential nature of instructions received by MPs from party whips, it is difficult to complete an accurate list of free votes in the House of Commons. However, despite all of the instructions given by party whips, MPs are allowed to vote as they want to in the House of Commons as, “all votes in Parliament are free.”<sup>12</sup> Additionally, in recent decades, MPs have become more and more rebellious, “to the point of voting against their own party.”<sup>13</sup> This shows that MPs are choosing to vote with their conscience and not with the party. Doing so, presents an ideal situation to study the factors of how and why an individual votes for legislation concerning the initiation and the continuation of the use of force by the state.

---

<sup>12</sup> “In praise of...free votes.” The Guardian.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/jan/12/immigrationpolicy.houseofcommons> Jan. 12, 2006

<sup>13</sup> Kavanagh, Dennis, et al. *British Politics*. Oxford University Press. Fifth Edition. 2006. Pg. 385

## CHAPTER THREE GENDER

As it was mentioned in chapter one, the focus of this thesis is on the individual level of analysis of decision makers in the run up to and continuation of an interstate conflict. The individual decision makers occupy “the most disaggregated level of analysis.”<sup>14</sup> At this level, the personal characteristics and experiences of the decision makers are taken into consideration and studied to see how the differences among individuals in certain positions influence the decisions that they make. Essentially, it questions: “In what ways- education and socialization, personality traits, or physical health- does the particular occupant of a major role in foreign policymaking differ from other individuals who have held or might have held the position in the past?”<sup>15</sup>

In this particular study, the following three individual characteristics will be studied of MPs in the House of Commons: gender, previous military experience, and political party affiliation. Each of these individual traits will be considered to see how they impact the voting practices of the MPs in the House of Commons in instances when the Parliament was asked to vote on initiating the use of force in an interstate conflict by the Defense Council and Cabinet.

### *The Gender Gap*

The first individual trait that this thesis focuses on is the role of gender and how it relates at the individual level of analysis to the voting practices of MPs in regards to legislation to initiate and continue the use of force by the United Kingdom. Gender plays an important role in politics, both foreign and domestic. It also impacts how men and women approach different

---

<sup>14</sup> Russett, Bruce et al. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Thomas Wadsworth Publishing. 2006. Pg. 15

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. Pg. 15

issues. In general, there is what is known as a gender gap between how men and women approach political issues, especially those regarding issues of foreign policy. It is said that “[w]omen at all education and income levels are generally more dovish on foreign policy than men.”<sup>16</sup>

In the United States, there has been a lot of research done into the role and perspectives of women on issues of foreign policy. For example, there was a Gallup poll done in 1991 of public opinion regarding the United States’ use of military force to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi occupation during the first Gulf War. The results from this poll clearly indicated to the existence of a gender gap in that 60% of men were in favor of the decision to use military force, whereas only 45% of women approved of the military operation. Even looking back to the atomic bombs being dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II, public opinion from 1995 indicates that more women were critical of the military action than men who approved the bombings at a 74% approval rate.<sup>17</sup>

Public opinion was once again gathered after the September 11, 2001, attacks in the United States to measure the level of support for military retaliation against al Qaeda. On the surface, these results seem to indicate that the gender gap had been eliminated since it was approximately 90% of both men and women who were in favor for military retaliation. However, upon further inspection of the results gathered, a gender gap does appear to exist. Women’s approval of the military retaliation was conditional and dependent on the potential costs that were associated with the military use of force.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Russett, Bruce et al. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Thomas Wadsworth Publishing. 2006. Pg 150

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. Pg 150

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. Pg. 150-151

There are two prominent explanations given for the existence of the gender gap. The first is “derived from ‘standpoint’ feminism.”<sup>19</sup> With this first view, it is believed that aggression and violence are solely male, or rather masculine, characteristics. This is in contrast to female characteristics, which are deemed to be more “forgiving and peace-loving.”<sup>20</sup> According to standpoint feminism, it is these characteristics that are clearly defined as masculine and feminine that has resulted in the current gender gap between men and women in their approach to foreign policy issues.

Furthermore, under standpoint feminism, there is a rather extreme explanation for the gender gap. This explanation takes on what is known as the “essentialist” view, which states that the gender gap exists due to the natural differences between men and women. Those who advocate the “essentialist” view “emphasize the differences between masculine and feminine roles as they have emerged from social practices.”<sup>21</sup> The feminine roles that have emerged from social practices are mainly nurturing roles. It is due to their nurturing roles that they are more aware of the human costs associated in a conflict and therefore are more likely to behave or approach the issue in such a way as to keep the human cost to a minimum. This has translated into their approach of foreign policy, which is more dovish in comparison to males who have hawk-like and aggressive tendencies.

The second explanation for the gender gap that exists in foreign policy is drawn from liberal feminism. According to this explanation, it is not due to “any natural inclination of women to differ from men in their attitudes about world politics, whether based on biological essence or socially constructed gender roles.”<sup>22</sup> Instead, it is believed that the gender gap is due

---

<sup>19</sup> Russett, Bruce et al. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Thomas Wadsworth Publishing. 2006. Pg. 150

<sup>20</sup> Ibid. Pg 150

<sup>21</sup> Ibid. Pg 150-151

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. Pg 151

primarily to socioeconomic and education differences that exist between men and women. If women had the same opportunities and were able to achieve the same level of education and socioeconomic circumstances as men, then they would approach global and foreign policy issues in the same manner that men do currently. Furthermore, if men and women enjoyed the same level of education and socioeconomic circumstances, then there would be no reason for the gender gap to exist. Women such as Indira Ghandi, Margaret Thatcher, and Golda Meir have been held up as examples that show if women had access to the same number of opportunities as men then they would “behave no differently from men in the conduct of foreign policy.”<sup>23</sup> These women have held high positions within their governments and have shown that their approach to foreign policy is no different than that of male counterparts in the same position.

Even though a lot of research has been done as to the existence of the gender gap in the United States through public opinion surveys and polls, the phenomenon of the gender gap is not strictly limited to the United States. The gender gap exists in a number of countries throughout the world. One of which is the United Kingdom. The following two hypotheses are focused on determining if the factor of gender impacts the voting practices of MPs in the United Kingdom House of Commons.

### *Hypothesis One*

When legislative bills come into the House of Commons over the issue of initiating the use of force, the female MPs are more likely to be against voting in favor of it. The reasoning behind this is due to the explanation offered from standpoint feminism, which highlights that female characteristics are geared more towards keeping the peace whereas men have personality traits that tend to be more violent and aggressive. These traits for both men and women have

---

<sup>23</sup> Russett, Bruce et al. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Thomas Wadsworth Publishing. 2006. Pg 152

emerged from social practices conducted over the centuries and serves as the reasoning behind why female MPs would not be as likely to vote in favor of the use of force.

*Hypothesis Two*

In terms of continuing the use of force, female MPs will be more likely to vote to end the use of force in a military operation than their male counterparts in House of Commons. This hypothesis is based on the idea that women have adapted a certain nurturing role through social practice, and this gender role allows for women to be more aware of the potential costs an armed conflict presents. Therefore, they will more likely want to end a conflict as soon as possible.

## CHAPTER FOUR MILITARY EXPERIENCE

The second of the three individual characteristics of the decision makers in the United Kingdom House of Commons, or MPs, to be considered is whether or not MPs have had previous military experience. There has been previous research done on how this characteristic influences the decision making process of politicians when it comes to initiating the use of force. It is commonly held among scholars that those with military experience in the political elite are more reluctant and cautious when it comes to sending troops into harms way.

Samuel Huntington first presented this idea of military conservatism in his article entitled “Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises” in 1957. Huntington’s “view of military organizations originally arose in answer to a decades-old stereotype that suggested that military officers are reckless, hawkish, and war-prone. His theory of military conservatism has since achieved widespread acceptance among Western security studies scholars. The conservative theory of military behavior contains three important theoretical precepts.... First, it highlights military organizational interests that weigh against both the use of force and the adoption of destabilizing military postures. Second, it suggests that civilians' inexperience with armed combat increases the likelihood they will favor using force in crises. Finally, although the theory argues that officers' outlook on international affairs predisposes them to be pessimistic about the inevitability of war, it maintains that civilians are generally more supportive of preventive war options.”<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Sechser, T. S. (2004). "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" The Journal of Conflict Resolution 48(5). Pg. 748

There are three aspects of military conservatism that are important in order to truly understand the concept. The first is that it is not in the interest of military organizations to initiate the use of force. This is because while civilians pay the financial costs of an interstate conflict, “the military pays for the [conflicts] with the blood of its members.”<sup>25</sup> The second feature of military conservatism is known as civilian naiveté. Civilians are somewhat ignorant of the capabilities and limitations of the military. They are more optimistic in the usefulness and success of a military commitment to action. Civilians are “[u]nguided by direct battle experience, the theory argues, civilians often underestimate the costs of military action and overestimate its utility.”<sup>26</sup> The third aspect of military conservatism is that military caution to the use of force by leaders with military experience is a strong feature of this theory, especially in comparison their civilian counterparts who strongly advocate for the use of force. Many times it is the civilian advisors who push and strongly influence political leaders into a conflict. For example, during the Kennedy administration in the United States, it was civilian strategists who pushed along in the administration for keeping China a non-nuclear state by conducting a preventative war.<sup>27</sup> All three aspects of military conservatism influence decision makers.

Almost 20 years later, Richard Betts confirmed Huntington’s argument of military conservatism through detailed case analyses. Betts found “that U.S. military officials were typically more timid than their civilian counterparts about recommending military action.”<sup>28</sup> Following Betts, a number of other scholars have found evidence to support Huntington’s idea of military conservatism. Jong Sun Lee in 1991 wrote a dissertation entitled “Attitudes of civilian and military leaders toward war initiation: Application of Richard Betts’ analysis of American

---

<sup>25</sup> Sechser, T. S. (2004). "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" The Journal of Conflict Resolution **48**(5). Pg. 748

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. Pg. 749

<sup>27</sup> Ibid. Pg. 749

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. Pg. 747



cases to other countries.” Lee’s dissertation took the ideas presented by Betts and of civil-military relations and studied different conflicts around the world. In his dissertation, he analyzed conflicts in the same manner as Betts had done, but focused on cases outside the United States such as the British involvement in the Suez Canal Crisis, Israel’s Six-Day War, and Egypt’s Ramadan War.

Todd Sechser’s article “Are Soldiers Less War Prone than Statesmen?” and Christopher Gelpi and Peter Feaver’s article “Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick? Veterans in the Political Elite and the American Use of Force” were in large part an inspiration for this research project. More than anything else, Sechser’s article helped in providing a thorough understanding of the concept of military conservatism. The purpose of his research, however, was to prove that the concept of military conservatism is overrated and that officials with military experience are just as likely if not more willing to initiate the use of force. Sechser’s conclusion does provide, “cross-national evidence in support of the argument that military officers are more likely than civilian to favor the use of force.”<sup>29</sup> However, the conclusion drawn from his research is largely dependent on whether or not military officers in power have the authority to initiate the use of force and the type of government structure a state has. Despite the stated conclusion, Sechser clarifies his statement saying that he does not refute the fact that “there is an overwhelming evidence elsewhere to suggest that US officers are at least as cautious as civilians about recommending military action and perhaps even more so.”<sup>30</sup>

While the content of Sechser’s article on military conservatism did impact the development of this thesis, it was more the quantitative approach that Gelpi and Feaver took in their research article that influenced this project. Their study revealed a military-civil gap in the

---

<sup>29</sup> Sechser, T. S. (2004). "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" The Journal of Conflict Resolution **48**(5). Pg. 770

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. Pg. 770

political elite in the United States and “that the gap had a profound effect on American military behavior from 1816 to 1992.”<sup>31</sup> While inspiration for the basis of this project comes from the Gelpi and Feaver article, there are many differences to this project. For one thing, this project is focusing on the initiation and continuation of the use of force in an interstate conflict by the United Kingdom instead of the United States. Secondly, the focus of this thesis is on the time period following the Cold War. This thesis will look at the political elite and decision makers in the House of Commons from 1991 to present day to determine how individual characteristics influence their voting behavior on issues concerning the use and continuation of force. Additionally, this project is not solely limited to the individual characteristic of previous military experience among individuals in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. Other traits, gender and political party affiliation, will also be studied.

Overall, it seems that there is “[a] widespread view among scholars of military affairs holds that professional soldiers are conservative. Because they pay for wars with their own blood, the logic goes, military officers are reluctant to order troops into harm's way. In contrast, civilian politicians, having never experienced the horror of combat, are more likely to engage in military adventures.”<sup>32</sup> The ideas and concepts presented in the theory of military conservatism as well as in the Gelpi and Feaver article of the civilian-military gap in the United States led to the following two hypotheses of how individual characteristics influence the decision making and voting practices of members of the United Kingdom Parliament.

---

<sup>31</sup> Gelpi, Christopher and Feaver, Peter D. (2002). “Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick? Veterans in the Political Elite and the American Use of Force.” *American Political Science Review*. Vol. 96. No. 5. Pg. 14

<sup>32</sup> Sechser, T. S. (2004). "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(5): Pg. 746

### *Hypothesis Three*

MPs with military experience are more likely to vote against a legislative bill in which the United Kingdom initiates the use of force in an interstate conflict. This is due to the fact that as veterans, they better understand the hardships and costs of a conflict than their civilian counterparts and do not want to rush into a war or conflict. Civilian members of the political elite, which in this case are MPs, are more likely to vote for initiating the use of force, despite the fact that they do not truly understand what it means to go to war.

### *Hypothesis Four*

Once military force is initiated by a state, then the political leaders who have had military experience will advocate for continuing the use of military force until the operations objectives have been achieved. This is in contrast to civilian leaders who would seek to end a military operation before the objectives have been achieved once the costs, both human and financial, of the military operation become clear to them.

## CHAPTER FIVE POLITICAL PARTY AFFILIATION

The last individual factor that this thesis studies is political party affiliation to see if there is a relationship with how an MP votes and a particular political party's ideology. The United Kingdom has a government structure, in which there are a number of different political parties that operate and voice their opinion in Parliament. However, in the United Kingdom there are two primary political parties that alternately dominate the Parliament: Labour and Conservative. These two political parties have battled for dominance in Parliament for decades. From 1979 to 1997, the Conservative party held control of Parliament. The Labour party took control of Parliament in 1997 and has maintained control to today.

The Labour party "was born from co-operation between trade unions, socialist societies, Fabians, and the Co-operative movement."<sup>33</sup> Each of these has influenced the development of the Labour Party ideology and the principles of which the party supports and advocates on behalf of: collectivism and co-operation, equality, the working class and underprivileged, and state ownership of certain utilities and industries.<sup>34</sup> The Labour Party in the United Kingdom is rather similar to the Democratic Party in the United States, which also believes in and advocates on behalf of the underprivileged and minorities in society like women.<sup>35</sup>

It is more difficult to understand the political ideology of the Conservative party in the United Kingdom or the set of governing principles for the party. This is because "[w]inning elections seems to have been a guiding principle, together with an acceptance that this requires

---

<sup>33</sup> Kavanagh, Dennis, et al. *British Politics*. Oxford University Press. Fifth Edition. 2006. Pg 74

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* Pg 74

<sup>35</sup> Democratic National Convention Committee. "The 2008 Democratic National Platform: Renewing America's Promise." 2008. Pg. 9-14

opportunism and flexibility.”<sup>36</sup> There are also three other principles that have been associated with the Conservative Party: pragmatism, gradualism, and “paternalism and an organic view of society.”<sup>37</sup> Further study of the Conservative Party shows that there are two divisions within the party: Neoliberals and One Nation Conservatives. Neoliberals place a greater emphasis on a limited government, free enterprise, and individual responsibility. One Nation Conservatives on the other hand “welcome state intervention to regulate the market [and] recognise links between social conditions and crimes.”<sup>38</sup>

The study of political party affiliation and ideology for this thesis was to determine if there was a single political party that had an ideology that more supported the initiation and continuation of the use of force. This idea was borne out of the idea that in the United States there is a rather similar situation. In the United States, there are two dominant political parties: Democrat and Republican. In recent years, there has been some polarization between the two parties, especially in regards to the use of force in Iraq in 2003. The Republican Party has emerged as more hawk-like with its aggressive tendencies when it comes to the use of force. In fact, over the 2003-2004 period, the percentage of those categorized as Hawks in the Republican Party has risen to 38%, which is twice the percentage in the Democratic Party. Additionally, those that identify themselves as Doves in the Democratic Party have also risen, indicating “that there are real and growing differences across the political aisle.”<sup>39</sup>

While in the United States there has recently been a significant shift in how the two major political parties approach foreign policy, in the United Kingdom the difference between the two

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. Pg. 73

<sup>37</sup> Kavanagh, Dennis, et al. *British Politics*. Oxford University Press. Fifth Edition. 2006. Pg 73

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. Pg 73

<sup>39</sup> Asmus R., Everts Philip P., Isernia P. “Across the Atlantic and the Political Aisle: The Double Divide in U.S.-European Relations.” German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2005. Pg 4

leading parties is much less subtle and less polarizing. The following two hypotheses were developed based on the ideas presented by the political parties of the United States and the United Kingdom.

#### *Hypothesis Five*

Of the two leading political parties in the United Kingdom, MPs that belong to the Conservative Party will be more likely to vote in favor of the initiation of the use of force. This hypothesis is based on the fact that the Conservative Party in the United Kingdom has the highest percentage of those who can be identified as Hawks, 12.3%, which is greater than any other center-right political party in Europe.<sup>40</sup> In contrast to this, it is hypothesized that MPs who belong to the Labour Party will be less likely to vote in favor of the initiation of the use of force, as the percentage of Hawks within their party is considerably less than the Conservative Party. Additionally, some similarities can be drawn from the Labour Party ideology in the United Kingdom and the Democrat Party in the United States. Both political parties strongly believe in equality and advocating for the underprivileged. The number of parallels that can be drawn between the two parties helps lend to the idea that it is possible for a parallel to exist between the Labour Party and the Democratic Party on foreign policy issues. This would mean that the Labour Party tends to be dovish when it comes to foreign policy issues, just like the Democratic Party is currently in the United States.

#### *Hypothesis Six*

In regards to the continuation of the use of force, it is hypothesized that the Conservative MPs will be more likely to continue the use of force until the military objectives are met. As there are a greater percentage of Hawks in this political party than the Labour Party. Due to the

---

<sup>40</sup> Asmus R., Everts Philip P., Isernia P. "Across the Atlantic and the Political Aisle: The Double Divide in U.S.-European Relations." German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2005. Pg 4

greater percentage of Hawks associated with the Conservative Party in the United Kingdom, they will be more likely and willing to stick to a military operation until its objectives are achieved.

## CHAPTER SIX VOTING LEGISLATION

### *Post-Cold War Conflicts*

In the post-Cold War era, the United Kingdom's armed forces have been involved in four conflicts in which military force was used. The first of the four conflicts was the Gulf War in 1991, in which the United Kingdom along with a multinational coalition that was led by the United States helped to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi occupation. Iraq, on command from Saddam Hussein, had on August 2, 1990, invaded and occupied Kuwait. This invasion outraged states around the world, and "both the United Nations and the United States undertook immediate action to get Iraq to withdraw"<sup>41</sup> from Kuwait. Tensions began to quickly rise, and finally an ultimatum was issued by the United Nations on November 29, 1990, in the form of Resolution 678: "UN members were authorized to use 'all means necessary' to bring about Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait and to restore international peace and security if Iraq did not withdraw by January 15, 1991."<sup>42</sup>

As the deadline approached and passed by, Iraq had made no move to withdraw forces from Kuwait. Therefore, coalition military action, led by the United States, was initiated. The name for the United Kingdom military operation during the Gulf War was called Operation Granby. The use of force continued until a cease-fire was called for on February 27, 1991. After the fighting ended, the United Nations passed Resolution 687, with Iraq's acceptance. This resolution placed many restrictions on the state of Iraq, including that Iraq had to destroy all of

---

<sup>41</sup> Cashman, Greg and Robinson, Leonard C. *An Introduction to the Causes of War*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2007. Pg. 299

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. Pg. 300



its weapons of mass destruction: nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. Additionally, Iraq had to allow UN inspectors into the country to make sure that Iraq would not develop such weapons again. The aftermath and consequences of the Gulf War in 1991 laid the foundation for the conflict in Iraq in 2003.

The second instance in which the United Kingdom initiated the use of force was in a military operation called Operation Allied Force. During this conflict the United Kingdom worked in alliance with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces to bring about a ceasefire between Serbian forces and the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA). The KLA was a rebel group that sought to achieve independence, so in 1997, they attacked Serbian police units. The following year “Serbian forces attacked KLA forces in Kosovo....[and] launched a campaign against Kosovo’s Albanians, driving many from their homes.”<sup>43</sup> Fighting continued for a number of years, and to this day, the tensions between Serbs and Albanians remains.

The third post-Cold War conflict the United Kingdom was involved in was Operation Enduring Freedom. The British named their military operation Operation Veritas, and “the British explicitly included as an object the destruction of the Taliban regime.”<sup>44</sup> This military operation was conducted in Afghanistan shortly after the al Qaeda attack terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, in the United States. On this day, a group of al Qaeda terrorists hijacked four airplanes. Two of the airplanes were crashed into the north and south towers of the World Trade Center in New York. The third airplane hit the Pentagon building in Washington, D.C. The fourth plane that was hijacked ultimately crashed in a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania. This plane never reached its target: the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. In the aftermath

---

<sup>43</sup> “Kosovo.” World Book Encyclopedia. 2006. Volume 11. Pg. 385

<sup>44</sup> Carlisle, Rodney P. *America at War: Iraq War*. Facts on File, Inc. 2007. Pg. 45

of this devastating attack, the United States launched a military campaign against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan.

What is very important to note about the September 11, 2001, attacks in the United States was the way it changed the foreign policy approach of the Bush administration. As it is stated in *An Introduction to the Causes of War* by Greg Cashman and Leonard C. Robinson, there was a shift “away from great powers politics and on to the links between international terrorism, rouge regimes, state sponsors of terrorism, and access to weapons of mass destruction. In Washington, mindsets were transformed and world events, including U.S.-Iraqi relations, began to be seen through a different set of conceptual lenses.”<sup>45</sup> The attacks on September 11, 2001, changed not only the outlook in the United States on global politics, but also how other states viewed and operated in the global system.

The last of the four conflicts in which the United Kingdom has used military force was in Iraq in 2003. This military operation was called Operation Telic, and it is the only one out of the four post-Cold War conflicts, which had legislation voted on in Parliament. After researching all of the legislation voted on by the House of Commons and Parliament as a whole in the post-Cold War era, the only conflict that had bills presented to the floor of the House of Commons for a vote was for initiating the use of force and declaring war in Iraq in 2003. This indicates that the Cabinet and Defense Council conducted all the first three conflicts in the post-Cold War era: Operations Granby, Allied Force and Veritas. While Parliament may have had discussions, debates, or inquiries on these three military operations, the Cabinet and Defense Council made all decisions concerning the initiation, continuation, and discontinuation of the use of force.

---

<sup>45</sup> Cashman, Greg and Robinson, Leonard C. *An Introduction to the Causes of War*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2007. Pg. 307

However, as noted earlier, these two bodies of the executive branch were ultimately held responsible and accountable to Parliament as a whole.

### *Iraq 2003*

As it was mentioned earlier in this chapter, the basis and issues of the conflict in Iraq in 2003 stretches back to the aftermath of the first Gulf War in 1991. The conflict against Iraq was jumpstarted soon after the military operations in Afghanistan had driven the Taliban out of power. The Iraq War was conducted due to what was deemed to be “continued defiance of the United Nations.”<sup>46</sup> The United States under the Bush administration initiated the use of force in Iraq under the doctrine of preemptive war. This doctrine is very controversial. However, despite this, the United States was joined by a coalition of armed forces from other states including the United Kingdom as the war in Iraq began on March 19, 2003. This is rather similar to the first Gulf War, in that there is a multinational coalition sending in armed forces to Iraq. By April 14, 2003, a little over one month after war was declared against Iraq, “all effective resistance by regular Iraqi armed forces ends.”<sup>47</sup> To this day, however, armed forces not only from the United States but also the United Kingdom and other participating states remain stationed in Iraq.

There were a total of five parliamentary votes associated with initiation of the use of military force and declaration of war by the United Kingdom against Iraq in 2003. It is important at this point to note that none of these five parliamentary votes were declared to be free votes, as they do not appear on the list of documented free votes in the House of Commons. However, as it was mentioned earlier that a complete and accurate list of free votes can not be compiled due to the confidential nature of party whip instructions. Additionally, holding the idea true that all votes are essentially free in Parliament and that there is a rising trend among MPs to

---

<sup>46</sup> Carlisle, Rodney P. *America at War: Iraq War*. Facts on File, Inc. 2007. Pg. vi

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* Pg. 154

rebel against party lines and vote how they wish to, then these five legislative votes ideally suit this thesis regarding the individual level of analysis of the initiation and the continuation of the use of force by the United Kingdom armed forces.

#### *Legislative Vote One*

The first of the five votes occurred on November 25, 2002 at 21:34. This legislative motion included two conditions which stated that the Government believes that any decision that Iraq is in material breach of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441 is for the Security Council alone to determine and that no military action should be taken without a United Nations mandate. Additionally, the legislation indicated that no British military force be used without a Parliament debate. Ultimately, the House of Commons rejected this piece of legislation.

#### *Legislative Vote Two*

The second legislative bill that was brought forth in the House of Commons in regards to the initiation of the use of force in Iraq in 2003 was on February 26, 2003 at 18:45. For this bill the Government voted on the inclusion of the following line: "...but finds the case for military action against Iraq as yet unproven." This bill like the previous one was ultimately rejected, and it shows that the majority of Parliament found that there is such a case for the United Kingdom to use military force against Iraq, believing that the case for the use of force has been proven.

#### *Legislative Vote Three*

The third vote in Parliament occurred less than one hour later on the same day of February 26, 2003, at 19:13. This legislative motion included the following: the Government taking note of Command Paper CM 5769, reaffirming the endorsement of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441, support for the Government's efforts with the United Nations to disarm Iraq of weapon's of mass destruction, and it also calls for Iraq to recognize its final

opportunity to comply with disarmament policies. This bill was passed in the House of Commons, and it shows a reaffirmation by the Government in its endorsement of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441.

#### *Legislative Vote Four*

The fourth bill in association with the run up to the initiation of the use of force by the United Kingdom in Iraq in 2003 was on March 18, 2003, at 21:15. This motion was ultimately rejected by the House of Commons, and presented to the Government the amendments to the declaration of war in Iraq. One amendment was that the case for war had not been established, citing a lack of authorization by the United Nations. Another amendment was that if the situation arises in which hostilities begin, then the United Kingdom will provide full military support. There were a number of other amendments to this motion, but as stated earlier, this motion did not pass. This means that the amendments were not included in the final vote by the House of Commons in regards to the use of force in Iraq, which will be discussed next.

#### *Legislative Vote Five*

The last of the five parliamentary motions was voted on March 18, 2003, at 22:00. This was the motion that officially declared war on Iraq in 2003 by the United Kingdom. The motion was passed by the House of Commons, and basically stated that the Government should use all means necessary to ensure the disarmament of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Due to the passage of this bill, the United Kingdom joined the United States in the invasion in Iraq in 2003 the following day on March 19, 2003.

## CHAPTER SEVEN METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this thesis is to determine if the following individual traits have any influence or impact on the voting behavior of MPs in the United Kingdom House of Commons: previous military experience, gender, and political party affiliation. In order to see how each of these traits relates to voting on legislation about initiating the use of force in the 2003 Iraq conflict, it is first necessary to construct a database of MPs in the House of Commons for all five legislative votes that occurred in 2002 and 2003. This database was compiled using information from MPs' personal biographies found on a BBC News database to accurately determine each of the individual characteristics of previous military experience, gender, and political party affiliation. After all of the individual factors were determined for all 651 MPs, then the next step is to find out how each MP voted for each of the five legislative votes mentioned in the previous chapter in the run up to the initiation of the Iraq War, which can be done by consulting both the Hansard and Public Whip websites. These two online sources provide detailed information on legislation and proceedings in the United Kingdom Parliament.

After creating the database, it is necessary to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between a MPs individual voting behavior and individual characteristics. By using chi-square test for independence, it is possible to see if an individual's traits and voting in a certain manner are dependent on one another. The chi-square test for independence basically determines if there is a statistically significant relationship between "the rows and

columns of a contingency table.”<sup>48</sup> All of the individual traits and how the MPs voted based on those traits have been placed in contingency tables and can be found on Tables 1-5. In total there are 15 tables (3 individual traits per each of the 5 legislative votes in the House of Commons) that breakdown the observed votes by the individual characteristics of MPs. In the chi-square test for independence, there are two methods of analysis that can be used. The first is the test statistic analysis method, and the other is the p-value method. For this project, both methods will be used. The test statistic method of analysis will be used to determine if there is any statistically significant relationship between the individual characteristics and how and MP votes. The p-value method will then be used to determine whether or not the relationships determined through the test statistic analysis are purely by chance. First, the method to calculate the test statistics will be described, and it will be followed by the p-value method.

The first step of chi-square testing is to establish the null and alternative hypotheses. The null hypothesis is “the statement about the population value that will be tested.”<sup>49</sup> In this case, the population is the House of Commons in the United Kingdom Parliament. From the data that is gathered and tested, the null hypothesis can either be rejected or not rejected. The second of the two hypotheses is the alternative hypothesis, which is essentially what is “deemed to be true if the null hypothesis is rejected.”<sup>50</sup> The standard null and alternative hypotheses for each individual trait to be tested are established below.

**Standard Null:  $H_0$ :** The individual trait (ie: gender, military experience, and political party affiliation) is independent of a MPs voting behavior of issues regarding the use of force.

---

<sup>48</sup> Rodriguez, Carlos. “Chi-Square Test for Independence.” <http://omega.albany.edu:8008/mat108dir/chi2independence/chi2in-m2h.html>. Apr. 28, 1998.

<sup>49</sup> Groebner, David F. et al. *Business Statistics: A Decision-Making Approach*. Sixth Addition. Prentice Hall Publishing. 2005. Pg. 304

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. Glossary

For gender, military experience, and political party affiliation, this means that there is no statistically significant relationship between how an MP votes and a particular individual characteristic. The null hypothesis essentially states that individual characteristics and the voting behavior of MPs are unrelated to each other.

**Alternative Hypothesis:  $H_A$ :** An individual's traits (ie: gender, military experience, political party affiliation) and a MPs voting behavior on issues regarding the use of force by the state are not independent.

For gender, military experience, and political party affiliation, this means that the alternative hypothesis states that the individual factor and voting behavior of MPs are not independent of each other and there is enough statistical evidence to prove this. Basically, the alternative hypothesis states that there is a relationship between the individual characteristics and how an MP votes, though it does not describe what type of relationship.

After the two hypotheses have been established, it is also necessary to specify the significance level ( $\alpha$ ) that will be used in order to conclude if there is a relationship or not between individual traits and voting behavior. For the purposes of this research and thesis, the significance level is set to 0.05 ( $\alpha=0.05$ ). The significance level indicates the maximum probability allowed to commit a Type I error, or incorrectly rejecting the null hypothesis based on data gathered. In this case, the 0.05 significance level means that there is 5% chance of error of committing a Type I error. Additionally, it means that one of the two hypotheses can be rejected with a 95% confidence. Once the significance level has been established, it is also necessary to determine the critical value, by first finding the degrees of freedom for each of the variables. To do this, apply the following equation to one of the tables of observed voting distributions:



$$\text{Degrees of Freedom} = (\text{Number of Rows} - 1)(\text{Number of Columns} - 1)$$

The degrees of freedom for each table helps in determining the critical value from a table that shows the values of  $X^2$  for selected probabilities.<sup>51</sup> For all of the tested variables the selected probability, also known as the significance levels, is 0.05. So the critical value can be determined based on the degree of freedom. For all of the calculations for this project, the degrees of freedom are either 2 or 4, so to see the critical values that were selected refer to Tables 6 and 7.

After having collected all of the observed data and establishing the significance level and critical value, it is then necessary to determine the expected values of each individual trait for all five legislative votes for the MPs. The expected values that are calculated by the following equations:

$$E = (rc)/n$$

The  $r$  variable refers to the specific number of votes in a row of the table, and the  $c$  variable refers to the number of votes in a column. The  $n$  variable refers to the total number total number of votes as a whole. For example, the expected number of males who voted “Yes” in the first vote is 68.338. This was calculated by multiplying the total number of males which 536 by the total number who voted “Yes.” The product is then divided by the overall total number of votes, which is 651, to get the expected value of 68.338. This calculation is done for all three variables and all five votes. Tables 1-5 have all of the expected values calculated and can be found in parentheses, next to the observed votes.

Now that the expected values have been calculated, the next step is to determine the test statistic values. The test statistic values will be compared to the critical values found earlier and

---

<sup>51</sup> Groebner, David F. et al. *Business Statistics: A Decision-Making Approach*. Sixth Addition. Prentice Hall Publishing. 2005. Appedix G. Pg. 746

will be used to determine whether or not to reject the null hypothesis. To determine the test statistic, the following equation is used.

$$X^2 = \sum (O-E)^2/E$$

The test statistic is calculated by taking the observed number of votes from a specific category and subtracting it from the expected number of votes. This number is then squared and divided by the expected number of votes. For example, to determine the test statistic for gender in the first legislative vote by the House of Commons, the first step is to find the number of observed votes for males who voted “Yes,” which is 73 votes. The expected value of votes that was found earlier for males who voted “Yes,” which is 68.338, is subtracted from the observed and then squared. The value that is found here is then divided by the expected value of 68.338. This calculation is done for males who voted “No” and females who voted “Yes” and “No.” The sum is then calculated, which for this individual trait is 2.074. This value is the test statistic that is then compared to the critical value. As there are a total of two rows and three columns, the degrees of freedom is 2. Using the critical values in Table 6, it can be determined that the critical value is 5.9915 at the significance level of 0.05. The two values, the test statistic of 2.074 and the critical value of 5.9915, are then compared.

$$\text{Test Statistics} < \text{Critical Value}$$

$$2.074 < 5.9915$$

Since the critical value is greater than the test statistics in this case, then the null hypothesis is not rejected with 95% confidence level. This means that it can be concluded that there is not enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis and that in the first legislative vote, the individual characteristic of gender and a MPs voting behavior is independent. In other words, how an MP votes for this first legislative vote is not due to any statistically significant

relationship with the MPs gender. The same statistical calculations are conducted for all five legislative votes and each individual characteristic. All of the calculated test statistic values for the five legislative votes can be found in Table 8. The results are further discussed in the following chapter.

The second method that was mentioned for analyzing relationships between variables was p-value calculations. By calculating the p-value, it can be determined if the relationship between the individual characteristic of MPs and their voting behavior is statistically significant or just by chance. The p-value itself can be calculated using the CHIDIST formula in Microsoft Excel. This formula calls for the input of a test statistic,  $X^2$ , from Table 8 as well as the appropriate degree of freedom for the appropriate individual characteristic. The higher the p-value is calculated to be, the less likely it is that “the observed relation between variables in the sample is a reliable indicator of the relation between the respective variables in the population.”<sup>52</sup> All of the p-values have been calculated for the five votes, and they can be found in second column of Table 8. The results calculated in this table are further discussed in the next chapter.

The final method of analysis on the data collected will be to apply both the test statistic and p-value methods of analysis to the aggregate total of the legislative votes in regards to supporting the initiation of the use of force. This will be done to see how the individual characteristics impacted as a whole the support or opposition of the use of force by the United Kingdom in the 2003 Iraq conflict. By studying the aggregate sum of the legislative votes cast in support or opposition of the use of force, a better understanding will be achieved on the relationship between individual characteristics and their influence on how MPs vote on legislation regarding the use of force.

---

<sup>52</sup> “Elementary Concepts in Statistics.” <http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/esc.html>. 2008.

In order to do the aggregate calculations, first, the sum of the votes in support of and in opposition to initiating the use of force needs to be calculated. While there are a total of five legislative votes that are studied in this research project, the votes by MPs in the fourth vote will not be included in the aggregate analysis. This is because the fourth legislative vote focuses more on the wording of the motion to declare war. The aggregate observed and expected votes for all three individual characteristics in support of the use of force can be found in Table 9. The test statistic analysis and p-value analysis will be done using the same methods described in this chapter, and the results will be displayed in Table 10.

In addition to the test statistic and p-value analyses, the aggregate percentages have been determined to see the overall degree to which MPs voted in favor of the initiation of the use of force based on gender, military experience, and political party affiliation. So, for example, to calculate the percentage of male MP votes that were in support of initiating the use of force, the total number of males who voted in support of the use of force needs to be calculated, which comes out to be 1359 votes by male MPs. Additionally, the total number of male MP votes for the four legislative votes is calculated, which is 2144. The next step is to divide 1359 by 2144, to get 63.39%. This aggregate percentage indicates how many male MP votes were in support of initiating the use of force. The same method of calculation is applied to all of the individual characteristics, and the final percentages are displayed in Table 11. These percentages will help to indicate over the aggregate total of votes how many of each tested individual characteristic were in support or opposition to the use of force. Additionally, the calculated percentages will help to describe any relationship that exists between individual characteristics and how an MP votes, as well as give better insight and understanding into the relationship.

**Tables 1-5:****Observed and Expected Votes**

The observed votes appear first in the box, followed by the calculated expected votes in parentheses.

**Vote 1:***Table 1.1*

<b>Gender</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Male	73 (68.338)	368 (371.330)	95 (96.332)	536
Female	10 (14.662)	83 (79.670)	22 (20.668)	115
Total	83	451	117	651

*Table 1.2*

<b>Military Experience</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Veteran	2 (4.845)	26 (26.326)	10 (6.829)	38
Civilian	81 (78.155)	425 (424.674)	107 (110.170)	613
Total	83	451	117	651

*Table 1.3*

<b>Political Party</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Labour	29 (51.890)	313 (281.961)	65 (73.147)	407
Conservative	0 (20.782)	134 (112.923)	29 (29.493)	163
Other	54 (10.327)	4 (56.115)	23 (14.558)	81
Total	83	451	117	651

**Vote 2:***Table 2.1*

<b>Gender</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Male	173 (163.023)	311 (322.753)	52 (50.224)	536
Female	25 (34.977)	81 (69.247)	9 (10.776)	115
Total	198	392	61	651

*Table 2.2*

<b>Military Experience</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Veteran	5 (11.558)	27 (22.882)	6 (3.561)	38
Civilian	193 (186.442)	365 (369.118)	55 (57.439)	613
Total	198	392	61	651

*Table 2.3*

<b>Political Party</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Labour	120 (123.788)	253 (245.075)	34 (38.137)	407
Conservative	13 (49.272)	128 (97.548)	21 (15.180)	162
Other	65 (24.940)	11 (49.376)	6 (7.684)	82
Total	198	392	61	651

**Vote 3:***Table 3.1*

<b>Gender</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Male	351 (357.333)	111 (102.095)	74 (76.571)	536
Female	83 (76.667)	13 (21.904)	19 (16.429)	115
Total	434	124	93	651

*Table 3.2*

<b>Military Experience</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Veteran	30 (25.333)	3 (7.238)	5 (5.429)	38
Civilian	404 (408.667)	121 (116.762)	88 (87.571)	613
Total	434	124	93	651

*Table 3.3*

<b>Political Party</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Labour	272 (272)	59 (77.714)	77 (58.286)	408
Conservative	151 (108)	0 (30.857)	11 (23.143)	162
Other	11 (54)	65 (15.429)	5 (11.571)	81
Total	434	124	93	651

**Vote 4:***Table 4.1*

<b>Gender</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Male	193 (178.667)	311 (326.046)	32 (31.287)	536
Female	24 (38.333)	85 (69.954)	6 (6.712)	115
Total	217	396	38	651

*Table 4.2*

<b>Military Experience</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Veteran	7 (12.667)	29 (23.115)	2 (2.218)	38
Civilian	210 (204.333)	367 (372.885)	36 (35.782)	613
Total	217	396	38	651

*Table 4.3*

<b>Political Party</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Labour	138 (135.667)	245 (247.576)	24 (23.757)	407
Conservative	15 (54)	139 (98.544)	8 (9.456)	162
Other	64 (27.333)	12 (49.880)	6 (4.786)	82
Total	217	396	38	651

**Vote 5:***Table 5.1*

<b>Gender</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Male	329 (339.220)	130 (122.679)	77 (74.101)	536
Female	83 (72.780)	19 (26.321)	13 (15.898)	115
Total	412	149	90	651

*Table 5.2*

<b>Military Experience</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Veteran	29 (24.049)	2 (8.679)	7 (5.253)	38
Civilian	383 (387.951)	147 (140.303)	83 (84.747)	613
Total	412	149	90	651

*Table 5.3*

<b>Political Party</b>	Yes	No	Abstain	Total
Labour	254 (258.212)	84 (93.382)	70 (56.406)	408
Conservative	146 (102.525)	2 (37.078)	14 (22.396)	162
Other	12 (51.262)	63 (18.539)	6 (11.198)	81
Total	412	149	90	651

**Table 6:**

**Critical Values at 2 Degrees of Freedom:**

Degrees of Freedom: 2	
Significance Levels	
0.01	9.2104
0.025	7.3778
<b>0.05</b>	<b>5.9915</b>

**Table 7:**

**Critical Values at 7 Degrees of Freedom:**

Degrees of Freedom: 4	
Significance Levels	
0.01	13.2767
0.025	11.1433
<b>0.05</b>	<b>9.4877</b>



**Table 8:****Test Statistic and P-Values:**

	<b>Test Statistics (<math>X^2</math>)</b>	<b>P-Values</b>
<b>Vote 1</b>		
Gender	2.074	0.354516638
Military Experience	3.341	0.188152966
Political Party	<b>277.126***</b>	0.354516638
<b>Vote 2</b>		
Gender	<b>6.234***</b>	0.044289839
Military Experience	<b>6.513***</b>	0.038522993
Political Party	<b>133.802***</b>	5.98606E-28
<b>Vote 3</b>		
Gender	5.521	0.06326013
Military Experience	3.584	0.166626583
Political Party	<b>262.108***</b>	1.60222E-55
<b>Vote 4</b>		
Gender	<b>10.532***</b>	0.005164226
Military Experience	4.306	0.116135229
Political Party	<b>123.331***</b>	1.03763E-25
<b>Vote 5</b>		
Gender	4.858	0.088124913
Military Experience	<b>7.176***</b>	0.027653582
Political Party	<b>198.168***</b>	9.3053E-42

\*\*\*Indicates a statistically significant relationship exists between the individual characteristic and an MPs voting practices.

**Table 9:****Observed and Expected Aggregate Sum of Votes in Support and Opposition of the Use of Force**

The observed votes appear first in the box, followed by the calculated expected votes in parentheses.

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Support	1359 (1390.636)	330 (298.364)	1689	
Oppose	487 (456.135)	67 (97.864)	554	
Abstain	298 (297.229)	63 (63.771)	361	
Total	2144	460	2604	
<b>Military Experience</b>	<b>Veteran</b>	<b>Civilian</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Support	112 (98.590)	1577 (1590.41)	1689	
Oppose	12 (32.338)	542 (521.662)	554	
Abstain	28 (21.072)	333 (339.928)	361	
Total	152	2452	2604	
<b>Political Party Affiliation</b>	<b>Labour</b>	<b>Conservative</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
Support	1092 (1055.949)	559 (422.899)	38 (210.152)	1689
Oppose	292 (346.356)	15 (138.713)	247(68.930)	554
Abstain	246 (225.694)	75 (90.389)	40 (44.917)	361
Total	1628	652	324	2604

**Table 10:****Aggregate Test Statistic Values and P-Values**

	Test Statistics ( $X^2$ )	P-Values
Gender	<b>15.908***</b>	0.000351
Military Experience	<b>17.940***</b>	0.000127
Political Party Affiliation	<b>796.912***</b>	2.5E-165

**Table 11:****Aggregate Percentages**

<b>Gender</b>	Male	Female	
Support	63.39%	71.74%	
Oppose	22.71%	14.57%	
Abstain	13.90%	13.70%	
<b>Military Experience</b>	Veteran	Civilian	
Support	73.68%	64.31%	
Oppose	7.89%	22.10%	
Abstain	18.42%	13.58%	
<b>Political Party Affiliation</b>	Labour	Conservative	Other
Support	67.08%	85.74%	11.73%
Oppose	17.94%	2.30%	76.23%
Abstain	15.11%	11.50%	12.35%

## CHAPTER EIGHT RESULTS

The methodology described in the previous chapter is used to determine the test statistic for each individual trait for all five votes that were conducted by the House of Commons prior to the declaration and initiation of war of in Iraq in 2003. For the first vote that occurred on November 25, 2002, the test statistics calculated for gender, previous military experience, and political party affiliation were the following, respectively: 2.074, 3.341, and 277.126. Each of these test statistics were then compared with their respective critical values in order to determine whether or not it was necessary to reject the null hypotheses stated for each individual trait. The critical values for both gender and previous military experience were found to be 5.9915 at 2 degrees of freedom. For political party affiliation, the critical value was 9.487 at 4 degrees of freedom. After comparing the test statistic to the critical values, the null hypothesis is not rejected for the individual traits of gender and previous military experience. By not rejecting the null hypothesis, with a 5% room for a Type I error, it can be determined that there is not a statistically significant relationship between gender and voting behavior of MPs. Additionally, there is not a statistically significant relationship between previous military experience and voting behavior of MPs. For both of these individual characteristics, this means that the MPs voting behavior was independent of gender and military experience. However, after comparing the test statistic and critical value for political party affiliation, it can be determined that the null hypothesis should be rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis since the critical value is greater. This means that there is enough statistical evidence provided by the test statistic to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis, which states that political party

affiliation and how an MP votes is not independent. In other words, how an MP voted on this first legislative motion is based on and related to the MP's political party.

The second vote occurred on February 26, 2003, at 18:45. The test statistics calculated for the three individual characteristics were 6.234 for gender, 6.513 for military experience, and 133.802 for political party affiliation. Each of these test statistics was then compared to the critical value at the respective degrees of freedom: 5.9915 for gender and military experience and 9.487 for political party affiliation. After comparing the test statistic and critical values, it is determined that the null hypotheses for these all three individual factors are rejected because the test statistics are greater than the critical values. By rejecting the null hypothesis, it is indicated that there is enough statistical evidence to show that the individual traits are not independent of the MPs voting behavior. So it must be accepted that how an MP votes and the three individual characteristics are related for this second legislative motion in regards to initiating the use of force.

The third vote conducted in the House of Commons in regards to the initiation of the use of force in Iraq in 2003 occurred on February 26, 2003, at 19:13. The test statistics were calculated using the method described in Chapter Six. For gender the test statistic was 5.521, for previous military experience it was 3.584, and for political party affiliation it was 262.108. These test statistics are then compared to the critical values at the proper degrees of freedom. Again for gender and previous military experience, the critical values were 5.9915. When comparing this critical value to the test statistic, there is not enough statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis and so it must be accepted. With 5% degree of error, it can be stated based from the third legislative vote that the individual characteristics of gender and previous military experience are independent from how an MP chooses to vote for an issue regarding the use of

force. For political party affiliation, the critical value at four degrees of freedom is 9.487. Since the test statistic is greater than the critical value, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it can be determined that there is a statistically significant relationship between political party affiliation and how an MP votes.

The fourth legislative vote in regards to the 2003 Iraq War in the House of Commons was on March 18, 2003, at 21:45. For gender, previous military experience, and political party affiliation, the test statistics are the following, respectively: 10.532, 4.306, and 123.331. These test statistics are then compared to their proper critical value. At 2 degrees of freedom, gender and previous military experience have a critical value of 5.9915. For gender, since the test statistic is greater than the critical value, the null hypothesis is rejected. By doing this, it indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between the gender of an MP and how the MP voted on this motion. For previous military experience, since the critical value of is greater than the test statistics, then the null hypothesis is not rejected. This means that for this particular vote, previous military experience and how an MP votes is unrelated to and independent of each other. At 4 degrees of freedom, political party affiliation has a critical value of 9.487. This critical value is less than the test statistic of 123.331, so the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, in regards to the fourth legislative vote, it can be determined that there is some type relationship between how an MP votes and political party affiliation as the two are not independent of each other.

The final vote that was studied for this thesis was on March 18, 2003, at 22:00. This legislative vote in the House of Commons was ultimately the declaration of war in Iraq in 2003. For gender, previous military experience, and political party affiliation the test statistics were calculated to be 4.858, 7.176, and 198.169, respectively. The selected critical values are used to

compare against the test statistic to determine if the null hypothesis should be rejected or not. For gender and previous military experience, the critical value is found at 2 degrees of freedom: 5.9915. The critical value is greater than the test statistic for gender, and so the null hypothesis is not rejected. This indicates that for this vote to declare war there is no relationship between the gender of an MP and how they chose to vote. However, for the individual traits of previous military experience and political party affiliation there is enough statistical evidence to indicate, with 5% error, that these two traits are not independent of how an MP votes on legislation regarding the use of force. For previous military experience and political party affiliation, the critical values were found to be 5.9915 and 9.487, respectively. When compared to the calculated test statistics, the critical value was less. Therefore, the null hypotheses are rejected as there is enough statistical evidence presented in support of the alternative hypothesis, which states that the two traits are not independent of how an MP votes.

In regards to the p-value calculations, the calculations for all five votes can be seen in Table 8. The results of the first vote indicate that due to the high p-values of gender, which was calculated to be 0.3545, and military experience, which is 0.1881, it is more likely that if there is any observed relationship between an MP's voting behavior and individual characteristic that it is by chance. In fact, as the comparison of the test statistic and critical values indicate, there is not enough statistical evidence to believe that there is a relationship. For the second vote, the p-value results for gender and military experience were found to be 0.0443 and 0.0385, respectively. Since these two calculations are less than the selected significance level of 0.05, it is determined that any relationship these two individual characteristics had with an MP's voting behavior is not by chance. In the third vote, the p-value of gender was 0.0632 and for military experience it was 0.1666. Both of these p-values are greater than the 0.05 significance level, so

it can be believed that the existence of a relationship between these two individual characteristic and how an MP votes is more likely to be by chance rather than an actual statistically significant relationship.

In the fourth vote, the p-value for gender was calculated to be 0.0052. This calculated p-value is rather low and is less than 0.05, the selected significance level. Due to this, the relationship between gender and how an MP votes is less likely to be due to chance and more likely due to a statistically significant relationship. For military experience, the calculated p-value of 0.1161 is rather high. It means that there is an 11.61% probability that any relationship between the two variables is a fluke, and that it is pretty unlikely that there is a statistically significant relationship between this factor and voting behavior. In the final vote, gender and military experience had a p-value of 0.0881 and 0.0277, respectively. Since the p-value for gender is greater than the 0.05 significance level, it is more likely that the existence of any relationship between gender and how an MP votes is due to chance than an actual statistically significant relationship. The opposite is true for military experience, since the p-value is calculated to be 0.0277 for this vote.

The p-values found for political party affiliation for all five votes were as follows: 92973E-59, 5.98606E-28, 1.60222E-55, 1.03763E-25, and 9.3053E-42. Due to the fact that these p-values are extremely low, the relationship found between this individual variable and how an MP votes is very unlikely due to chance. All five vote individually indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables, and that there is basically an almost 0% probability that the relationship is due to chance.

The last method of analysis discussed in the previous chapter was to look at the aggregate sum of all the votes in support of and in opposition to the initiation of the use of force. When



conducting these calculations, only four of the five votes were used due to the fact that the fourth legislative vote was focused primarily on the wording of the declaration of war in the fifth vote. When using the method of comparing the test statistic to the critical value, it was discovered that there was a statistically significant between all of the individual characteristics of gender, military experience, and political party affiliation and how an MP votes. This indicates that with only a 5% room for a Type I error, all of the individual characteristics influence the voting behavior of MPs. By calculating the p-values for gender, military experience, and political party affiliation as 0.000351, 0.000127, and 2.5E-165, respectively, this indicates that there is very little probability that the relationship between the variables is just by chance. However, due to the nature of chi-square testing, it does not indicate the exact nature of the relationship is between the variables.

In Table 11, the aggregate percentages were calculated, and they yield some pretty interesting results. For gender, female MPs were found to vote in support of the use of force at 71.74%, which is greater than the percentage of male MPs in favor of the use of force. For the individual trait of military experience, MPs who have military experience were found to vote in support of the use for 73.68% of the time. This is greater than MPs without any military experience who supported the use of force at 64.31%. In the last individual characteristic of political party affiliation, 85.74% of the Conservative MPs were in support of the use of force, in comparison to the 67.08% of Labour MPs in support of the use of force. However, within the Labour Party, there was a greater percentage of MPs in favor of the use of force. While 67.08% were in support of the use of force, only 17.94% of Labour MPs were opposed to initiating the use of force.

## CHAPTER NINE CONCLUSION

According to the results found, there are three major conclusions that can be made in regards to the individual level analysis to the cause of war. The results show how each individual characteristic, gender, military experience, and political party affiliation, of MPs in the House of Commons in the United Kingdom related to the MPs voting behavior on issues concerning the initiation and use of force. However, it is also important to note that only the first, third, and fifth hypotheses were tested. These three hypotheses were the one the only ones tested because the five legislative votes brought forth to the House of Commons in Parliament were only in regards to the initiation of the use of force and declaration of war in Iraq in 2003. There have not been any legislative bills presented for a vote in the House of Commons to officially declare an end to the use of force in Iraq nor were there any such bills for the other three conflicts in the post-Cold War era by the United Kingdom. This means the second, fourth, and sixth hypotheses cannot be tested yet as there has not been any legislation for the House of Commons to vote on in regards to continuation of the use of force.

However, despite the fact that three of the hypotheses were not tested, there were three hypotheses that were tested using the chi-square independence test. These three hypotheses as noted above were all in regards to the initiation of the use of force in a military conflict by the United Kingdom. From the results gathered after testing those three hypotheses, it is possible to draw three conclusions in regards to how each individual characteristic of gender, previous military experience, and political party affiliation related to how the MPs voted for legislation initiating the use of force.

## *Gender*

The results gathered from all five individual legislative votes on the bills regarding the initiation of the use of force in the 2003 conflict in Iraq were rather contradictory. For three of the votes, it was found that there was no statistically significant relationship between an MP's gender and how they voted on the issue to initiate the use of force. However, the other two legislative motions indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between the two variables. In order to draw a clearer conclusion, it is necessary to look at the aggregate calculations. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, using the aggregate totals will help to provide a better overall understanding of how gender and the voting behavior of MPs are related to each other. When taken at the aggregate level, there was a statistically significant relationship found between the two variables.

However, just because a statistically significant relationship was found through chi-square testing does not mean that the type or nature of relationship was also determined. In order to figure out how gender affected the support of the initiation of the use of force, the aggregate percentage of how male and female MPs voted was calculated. Once this was done, it was discovered, that female MPs were just as, if not more likely to be in support of the use of force by the United Kingdom than their male counterparts. Female MPs voted in support of the use of force at 71.74%, which is greater than male MPs who voted in favor at 63.39%.

The results found in this study firmly reject the concepts presented in standpoint feminism in which the hypothesis is based on for the initiation of the use of force. The view according to standpoint feminism is that in regards to foreign policy, women adopt more dovish and peacekeeping traits. On the other hand, men are more aggressive and willing to use force than women. The results from this research, however, indicate that this may not be the case. It

shows that women were just as likely if not more willing than their male counterparts to vote in support of the use of force. This shows that the concepts underlying liberal feminism may in fact be true.

However, there is one other alternative explanation. A majority of the women who voted in favor of initiating the use of force were members of the Labour party, which currently serves as the governing party in Parliament in the United Kingdom. During the late 1990s, there were quotas used by the Labour Party in an effort to increase female participation in the House of Commons. As a result of this, there were a greater number of females elected into Parliament as members of the Labour Party. Even though such quotas have been deemed illegal, their effects remain. It is possible that female MPs voted in favor of the initiation of the use of force for all five legislative votes in regards to the 2003 Iraq War out of a sense of loyalty to the Labour Party, since it was the Labour Party that was in control of the government and leading the agenda to initiate the use of military force in Iraq. The female MPs that voted in favor of the initiation of the use of force, therefore, may have done so not due to having equal opportunities offered to them as liberal feminism claims. Instead they could have done so solely out of party loyalty and a desire to remain in office by voting with the majority and governing party. One possible solution to determining if it was party loyalty or gender influencing how female MPs voted is to hold party loyalty as a constant by focusing separately on the Labour and Conservative parties to see how male and female MPs voted within each party. By doing this, the degree of party loyalty is more or less constant, and the results would be a better indicator of if and how gender relates to the voting practices of MPs on legislation regarding the use of force.

### *Military Experience*

The results found in regards to the individual characteristic of previous military experience by MPs of the House of Commons are similar to the results found by testing the role of gender in the five legislative votes. The results of the individual votes were also not consistent, and so it is best to refer to the aggregate results rather than the individual vote results when drawing a conclusion about how the voting practices of MPs are related to MPs having had military experience.

The hypothesis in the thesis stated that there would be a relationship between the two variables in that having military experience would make MPs more inclined to be cautious in regards to legislation concerning the use of force and not vote in favor of it. This hypothesis was based on the theory of military conservatism that was developed by Samuel Huntington and had been accepted by many international relations scholars. The results found at the aggregate level indicate that there was some sort of relationship between MPs having had previous military experience and how they voted in support of initiating the use of force. While the test statistic method of analysis indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two variables, it does not describe what type of relationship. The aggregate percentages helped describe the relationship between the two variables. MPs with military experience voted in support of the use of force at a higher rate of 73.68%, which is greater than the civilian percentage of only 64.31%. It can, therefore, be concluded that MPs with military experience were just as likely, if not more, to be in favor of supporting the initiation of the use of force in Iraq in 2003.

The conclusion drawn for this individual trait by the results calculated could be explained by the fact that the theory of military conservatism was developed during the Cold War. During

this period in history, the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, stood toe to toe against each other and were only divided by the Iron Curtain. The mindset and perspectives of this time period may no longer be applicable today in the post-Cold War era. There is no red scare to worry about anymore. However, the current and new era has presented a different type of environment in which global politics operates. Western democratic states no longer fear communism as they used to. Instead terrorism, rouge nations, weapons of mass destruction, and religious extremism are greater issues of concern for and not just for the Western states. This shift in perspective could be the explanation as to why those decision makers with a military past are just as likely to be in favor for initiating and continuing the use of force. They see the danger posed by these new threats, and with less fear of mutually assured destruction as it was in the Cold War, these decision makers will be just as likely to be in favor of the use of force over an alternative dispute resolution method.

#### *Political Party Affiliation*

It can be concluded from the results gathered from the chi-square test of independence for all five legislative votes conducted by the House of Commons that political party affiliation and how an MP votes is not independent of each other. Meaning there is a statistically significant relationship between the two factors. Additionally, with the p-values for all the votes being so low, the relationship cannot be purely by chance. The results of the chi-square testing for each of the legislative votes and for the aggregate sum of votes indicate that there was a statistically significant relationship between the two factors. At the aggregate level of analysis, the results of the percentage calculations can help to describe the relationship. The results, at the aggregate level, indicate that Conservative MPs were 85.74% in support of the use of force, as compared to

the Labour MPs 67.08%. These results indicate that the hypothesis stated earlier in regards to how Conservative MPs would vote based on political party affiliation was correct.

However, it is worth mentioning that within the Labour Party, there was a greater percentage of MPs who were in support of the use of force. While 67.08% were in support of the use of force, only 17.94% of Labour MPs were opposed to initiating the use of force. While it has been determined both at the individual and aggregate level that there is statistically significant relationship between an MP's political party affiliation and how that MP votes, the meaning of the results, however, are not quite as clear cut without the calculated aggregate percentages. This is because the chi-square test for independence only shows that there is a relationship between the two variables. It does not explain *why* such a relationship exists between variables. Using percentages to breakdown how MPs voted helps in better understanding the relationship between individual characteristics and an MP's voting behavior.

The unique aspect of a greater percentage of Labour MPs voting in support of the use of force rather than opposing it as described previously can be explained. This explanation is based on the idea that party loyalty to the Labour party and the Prime Minister has strongly influenced how the MPs voted. As with many elected officials, one of their primary concerns is re-election into office. It could, therefore, be possible that MPs voted the way they did in order to stay in favor of party leaders and be endorsed when running for re-election. It might have nothing at all to do with party ideology and everything to do with re-election into office.

Another reason as to why the party loyalty seems to be the reasonable explanation is due to the ideology of the Labour Party itself. There are certain similarities that can be drawn between the Labour Party in the United Kingdom and the Democratic Party in the United States. Both political parties have placed a strong emphasis and remain committed on achieving equality

for citizens and helping minorities and the underprivileged.<sup>53</sup> So it is possible to consider the Labour Party to be more dovish, especially compared to the fact that the Conservative Party has the greater percentage of Hawks within their party. However, despite all of this, the MPs of the Labour Party voted in favor of the initiation of the use of force while Conservative MPs voted against it. What could have caused this shift away from the party's ideology other than loyalty to the party and Prime Minister Tony Blair, who maintained a very close and strong alliance with President Bush in the United States.

After having reviewed the conclusions and explanations stated above, it is important to remember a few key points about this research project. The first is that the conclusions drawn in this chapter are based on a single case study of the Iraq conflict in 2003, which in itself is a very unique conflict. There are no other conflicts in which the United Kingdom participated in that has legislation that the House of Commons voted on in the post-Cold War era in that can provide data to either support or reject the conclusions drawn in this chapter.

Additionally, the focus of this research project is on the MPs voting practices in the House of Commons, which is a very large scope to study at the individual level of analysis. An alternative option could be to focus the study instead to only the key players involved in the run up to the initiation of the use of force by the United Kingdom: Prime Minister Tony Blair and his Cabinet. The research and analysis done on these key individuals could provide further insight at the individual level as to why states, or at least the United Kingdom in particular, chooses to initiate and continue the use of force.

Overall, this thesis and research project have explored previously held ideas and notions about individual characteristics and the analysis of the cause of war at the individual level.

---

<sup>53</sup> Democratic National Convention Committee. "The 2008 Democratic National Platform: Renewing America's Promise." 2008. Pg. 9-14



Either these notions were confirmed by the findings presented, or they were rejected in favor of an alternative idea or explanation. While no unifying or grand theory was developed by this thesis, the knowledge and information gathered can, hopefully, provide a new perspective into understanding the causes of interstate war and why states choose to initiate and continue the use of force.

## WORKS CITED

- Cashman, Greg and Robinson, Leonard C. *An Introduction to the Causes of War*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2007.
- Russett, Bruce et al. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Thomas Wadsworth Publishing. 2006.
- Kavanagh, Dennis, et al. *British Politics*. Oxford University Press. Fifth Edition. 2006.
- Turner, Barry. *The Statesman's Yearbook 2009: The Politics, Cultures, and Economies of the World*. Macmillian Publishers. 2008.
- Groebner, David F. et al. *Business Statistics: A Decision-Making Approach*. Sixth Addition. Prentice Hall Publishing. 2005.
- O'Neil, Patrick. *Essentials of Comparative Politics*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc. Second Edition. 2007
- CIA World Factbook. "United Kingdom."  
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/UK.html>
- Bowers, Paul. "Parliament and the use of force."  
<http://www.parliament.uk/documents/upload/snua-01218.pdf>. (PDF file) Standard Note. Feb. 25, 2003
- Public Whip. "Iraq — Case for war not established — rejected — 18 Mar 2003 at 21:15"  
<http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/division.php?date=2003-03-18&number=117>
- Public Whip. "Iraq — UN Security Council Resolution 1441 — Second resolution necessary — rejected — 25 Nov 2002 at 21:34."  
<http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/division.php?date=2002-11-25&number=6>
- Public Whip. "Iraq — Declaration of War — 18 Mar 2003 at 22:00."  
<http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/division.php?date=2003-03-18&number=118>
- Public Whip. "Iraq — Case for war is unproven — rejected — 26 Feb 2003 at 18:45."  
<http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/division.php?date=2003-02-26&number=96>
- Public Whip. "Iraq — Support for the Government — 26 Feb 2003 at 19:13."  
<http://www.publicwhip.org.uk/division.php?date=2003-02-26&number=97>

Hansard 1803-2005. <http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/>

“Guide to peers and House of Lords.” BBC News.  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk\\_news/politics/4828094.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4828094.stm). Jan. 27, 2009.

“In praise of...free votes.” The Guardian.  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/jan/12/immigrationpolicy.houseofcommons> Jan. 12, 2006

BBC News. UK Politics. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/politics/default.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/default.stm)

“Kosovo.” World Book Encyclopedia. 2006. Volume 11. Pg. 385

“United Kingdom.” World Book Encyclopedia. 2006. Volume 20. Pgs. 48-74

Carlisle, Rodney P. *America at War: Iraq War*. Facts on File, Inc. 2007.

Sechser, T. S. (2004). "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" The Journal of Conflict Resolution **48**(5): 746-774.

MPs Database. BBC NEWS. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/politics/2065154.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/2065154.stm).

Gelpi, Christopher and Feaver, Peter D. (2002). “Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick? Veterans in the Political Elite and the American Use of Force.” American Political Science Review. Vol. 96. No. 5. Pgs. 779-793.

Rodriguez, Carlos. “Chi-Square Test for Independence.”  
<http://omega.albany.edu:8008/mat108dir/chi2independence/chi2in-m2h.html>. Apr. 28, 1998.

Hudson, Valerie M. *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 2007.

Asmus R., Everts Philip P., Isernia P. “Across the Atlantic and the Political Aisle: The Double Divide in U.S.-European Relations.” German Marshall Fund of the United States, 2005.

Democratic National Convention Committee. “The 2008 Democratic National Platform: Renewing America’s Promise.” 2008.

“Elementary Concepts in Statistics.” <http://www.statsoft.com/textbook/esc.html>. 2008.