

Peace and Disarmament Activism and Foreign Policy

Presentation to 43rd Otago Foreign Policy School, Dunedin 22 June 2008

by Kate Dewes

Introduction

The twentieth anniversary of the passing of New Zealand's historic 1987 nuclear free legislation was marked in Christchurch by an exhibition in the Canterbury Museum which showcased iconic peace movement memorabilia. This included the 1963 'No Bombs South of the Line' petition, posters, badges, stickers, photos, magazines, stamps, artwork, music and excerpts from Prime Minister David Lange's 1985 Oxford Union debate. It was a celebration of the diversity, imagination, courage and stamina of the country's peace movement and some key politicians over the last 60 years.

On 12 June 2007 many of our elected representatives congregated on the steps of Parliament wearing 'Nuclear Free Nation' tee shirts and badges to mark the occasion. They then returned to the House of Representatives to pass a unanimous resolution marking the anniversary, resolving that New Zealand should continue to work for a nuclear weapon free world.¹

Parliamentarians from all political persuasions used the opportunity to honour the politicians and peace campaigners who had withstood acrimony for their leadership in ensuring this iconic piece of legislation was passed and sustained. Twenty years earlier, Lange had been prophetic when he had stated that "the Bill will not allow any successive New Zealand Government to reverse that policy without first going through a test of democratic opinion at a general election and, secondly, without subjecting its legislative process for repeal to the scrutiny of an informed House of Representatives and the general public."²

This paper outlines some examples of peace movement initiatives which have influenced the development of defence, foreign affairs and disarmament policies in Aotearoa/New Zealand, especially during the past 30 years. It discusses whether the Public Advisory Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control has been an effective mechanism to facilitate a process of participatory democracy on some highly sensitive international issues.

The nuclear free policy and subsequent legislation were arguably New Zealand's most significant foreign policy achievements forged through a partnership between civil society and politicians. Their success helped underpin future citizen-led disarmament initiatives such as the World Court Project, Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, and the bans on anti-personnel landmines and cluster

munitions. These built on earlier peace movement campaigns where governments responded by adjusting foreign policy to reflect public concern.

Opposition to Nuclear Tests

When New Zealand's traditional allies -the US, UK, and France -blatantly tested their nuclear weapons in Australia and the Pacific, many politicians and most ordinary citizens were outraged. In 1963 the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) collected 80,238 signatures calling for a Southern Hemisphere nuclear free zone. In 1972 Auckland CND launched another petition (81,475) calling on the government to take action at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) on "the question of the infringement of human rights and international law by France", and Peace Media organised an international Peace Fleet to sail to the nuclear test site at Moruroa. When the French Navy rammed a protest vessel, the worldwide publicity helped embolden the Labour government, led by Norman Kirk, to make resolute anti-nuclear election promises.³

In 1973, New Zealand joined Australia to take France to the International Court of Justice (ICJ) seeking a legal ruling against atmospheric testing and an immediate injunction to stop them while the case proceeded. The ICJ accepted the case and approved the injunction request.⁴ When France indicated it would continue testing, Prime Minister Kirk announced that a frigate, with a Cabinet Minister on board, would sail to the test site to mobilise world opinion to help persuade France to comply with the ICJ's order.⁵ International media coverage ensured that over 800 million people saw the frigate approaching Moruroa on television.⁶ Although France refused to appear at the World Court, it later announced it would halt atmospheric testing and only test underground in future. The ICJ discontinued the case, but New Zealand's primary objective of ending atmospheric testing in the Pacific was achieved.

Emerging Nuclear Allergy: 1974-1984

Sadly, Kirk died suddenly in August 1973. He had prepared the ground for radical action by David Lange in the 1980s by initiating the transition from traditional dependence on Western military ideology to a more South Pacific-oriented identity and independent foreign policy. His promotion of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone (SPNFZ) via a UN resolution bore fruit a decade later.

With National's re-election in 1975, New Zealand foreign policy reverted to a more subservient, pro-ANZUS position. National mothballed the SPNFZ initiative, and invited US and UK nuclear-powered and possibly armed vessels to visit. In June 1976, in opposition to the proposal to build a nuclear power plant, Greenpeace and others organised the 'Campaign Half Million' petition resulting in 333,087 signatures. The subsequent New Zealand policy remains opposed to nuclear power for electricity generation.⁷

During the mid to late 1970s, public anger at the nuclear ship visits spilled over into waterborne protests by Peace Squadrons, again attracting international media interest.⁸

People organised large marches demanding a ban, and in 1981 began declaring homes, schools, local councils and boroughs nuclear free zones. By 1983 a network of over 300 small neighbourhood and other independent peace groups, not bound by political ideology, had mushroomed throughout the country. These included special interest groups from the churches, doctors, lawyers, engineers, scientists, artists, Maori, women and the National Party. They worked within communities lobbying local politicians and city councillors, some of whom became active members of these groups. This resulted in widespread public participation, and created accountability in most electorates to which political parties became extremely sensitive.

Opinion polls reflected the growing awareness. In 1978, 51% supported visits by US nuclear-powered ships with 39% agreeing to the use of US nuclear weapons in New Zealand's defence.⁹ Prior to the 1984 election, only 30% supported visits with 58% opposed,¹⁰ and 61% of the population lived in locally declared nuclear free zones. Three of the four main political parties adopted strong anti-nuclear policies in response to this shift in public opinion.¹¹

In July 1984, the Labour Opposition introduced a nuclear free New Zealand bill calling for the prohibition of nuclear weapons from its territory. It resulted in the snap election, during which the Labour Party pledged to pass nuclear free legislation, promote SPNFZ and renegotiate the ANZUS Treaty to accommodate this. The policy was seen as a test of democratic process and New Zealand's sovereignty.¹² It found favour nationwide, and Labour's landslide victory owed much to the anti-nuclear vote.

For the next few years the government came under intense pressure from the US, UK and Australia who feared the spread of the 'Kiwi disease' to other important allies such as Japan, Denmark and the Philippines. Political pressure from the US had convinced Australia to drop its proposed anti-nuclear policy, and it was assumed that similar pressure on New Zealand would have the same effect. However, the Reagan administration underestimated the widespread anti-nuclear resolve among the public and Lange's commitment to the policy. He had earned the peace movement's respect when, as a lawyer, he had defended a former Labour Education Minister in the domestic courts, following high-profile Peace Squadron actions.

US political pressure included demotion from ally to 'friend', curtailment of military cooperation, threats to trade, attempts to destabilise the Labour government, and diplomatic ostracism from the Western group.

Lange was assisted by a massive mobilisation of the peace movement, both in New Zealand and the US.¹³ Ironically, the sinking in 1985 by French government agents of the Greenpeace flagship *Rainbow Warrior* followed by the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear power plant explosion helped strengthen the government's resolve, and undoubtedly swung the majority of the public behind it.

A 1986 opinion poll confirmed that 92% opposed nuclear weapons in New Zealand and 69% opposed warship visits; 92% wanted New Zealand to promote nuclear disarmament

through the UN, while 88% supported the promotion of nuclear free zones.¹⁴

When the Nuclear Free Act was finally passed in June 1987, it formally established New Zealand territory and coastal waters as a Nuclear Free Zone, and uniquely banned visits by both nuclear-powered and armed vessels and aircraft. Again, Labour's re-election could be partially attributed to the success of this policy. Prime Minister Lange acknowledged the public's role in maintaining its integrity:

*There is no doubt that the anti-nuclear movement is, in New Zealand, a mainstream cause. Successive governments have been helped to be honest or kept honest by the commitment of sincere people who started out as the shock troops to shift the centre of gravity and who remain vigilant as the trustees of what has now become a New Zealand characteristic.*¹⁵

Public Advisory Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control

The Act included provision for an eight-member Public Advisory Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control (PACDAC) as formal 'trustees' of the policy.¹⁶ It is probably the only one of its kind in the world¹⁷ and has the statutory responsibility to "advise the Minister of Foreign Affairs on such aspects of disarmament and arms control matters as it thinks fit; advise the Prime Minister on the implementation of the Act, and to publish from time to time public reports" in relation to the above. Although PACDAC was chaired by the Minister of Disarmament and Arms Control it was free to "regulate its procedure in such a manner as it thinks fit."¹⁸

The first committee, appointed in December 1987, met six times a year for a whole day over the next three years and was chaired at different times by both Foreign Minister Russell Marshall and Disarmament Minister Fran Wilde. Committee members had the power to put any item onto the agenda, request papers from the Ministry, meet with relevant caucus committees, and invite peace researchers and others to address them. Twice they met briefly with the Prime Minister.

The Ministers had no power of veto, but sometimes abstained on controversial resolutions passed unanimously by the rest of the Committee. At times this resulted in embarrassing headlines such as "New Zealand's two-faced nuclear stance", "NZ in Star Wars at Black Birch" and "We join N-force: NZ fleet presence 'breach of policy'". Despite this, Minister Wilde reported regularly to peace groups via newsletters, and requested their feedback.

This committee comprised a former Defence Minister and leading representatives of a diverse peace movement from the three main cities including a scientist, doctor, academic, teacher, Quaker and Maori churchman. It was the only PACDAC to achieve gender equity; and over the two decades less than five Maori have been appointed.

The first PACDAC actively advised government on the formulation of a consistent anti-nuclear policy by systematically scrutinising voting on UN disarmament resolutions, reviewing membership of military alliances and agreements, and activities such as the Echelon satellite communications interception system at Waihopai.¹⁹ Other agenda items

included the purchase of frigates from Australia; the World Court Project; the visit of a US ship carrying radioactive waste from Antarctica; aircraft visiting the US base near Christchurch airport; entrenchment of the anti-nuclear legislation; accountability of the Government Communications Bureau, and input into the Annual Defence Assessment process. The committee also asked for a legal opinion as to whether NZ troops and transport planes could participate in the first Gulf War in 1991 if they were under US, not UN command, and nuclear weapons were potentially part of the arsenal.

Challenging Black Birch

At the outset veteran peace researcher Owen Wilkes was skeptical whether the group would hold the government accountable and influence policy:

*There are some very good peace activists appointed to the committee, and the Black Birch issue has become an important test of whether PACDAC can serve as a conduit for peace movement concerns, or whether it will be used by the government to co-opt and neutralise key activists.*²⁰

The question was whether the Black Birch Astrometric Observatory operated by the US Naval Observatory near Blenheim was contravening the nuclear free legislation. Within the US, the Navy had always acknowledged that it was being operated for primarily military reasons and that it was vital to the successful functioning of US strategic and nuclear weapon systems. However, when the Head of the US Navy's Astronomy Division, Dr James Hughes visited New Zealand in 1982, he had maintained that it was an innocent scientific endeavour with no more than peripheral relevance to the arms race.²¹

In 1989, peace researcher Dr Peter Wills obtained official documents inadvertently confirming that Black Birch data would make Trident programmes and Star Wars weapons more accurate. A US town planning commission was told that “without either the New Zealand or Washington observatories, ten per cent of US missiles would miss their targets.”²² Following a briefing by Owen Wilkes, PACDAC asked the government to clarify if Black Birch contravened the Act, and recommended that it be converted to civilian control to limit the use of the data to non-military applications.

This alerted the media to expose the inconsistencies of arguments coming from Dr Hughes and the Minister of Foreign Affairs.²³ A TV1 documentary reported former Defence Minister Frank O’Flynn saying that New Zealand had been subjected to “outrageous deception” by the US over Black Birch. Within weeks Dr Hughes briefed PACDAC members and the Minister during a fact-finding mission at the observatory. He was visibly shaken when members quoted his contradictory testimony to the US town planning tribunal.

Exposing the US Navy’s true intentions to use the data for future accuracy of nuclear weapons highlighted the deception underlying some of New Zealand’s military agreements. Government officials, US Naval Observatory staff and politicians were forced to respond to well-documented peace research. Not surprisingly, certain evidence

requested by PACDAC under the US Freedom of Information Act was denied.²⁴ In November 1991 the US Navy announced that Black Birch would close down.

Ironically, the Black Birch controversy highlighted yet another possible infringement of the Act, when peace researchers documented the role of a French beacon transmitter installed in the remote Chatham Islands. It was linked to the Doppler Orbitography and Radio Positioning Integrated by Satellite (DORIS) system which provided precise determination of the orbits of French SPOT photographic satellites.²⁵

The Government admitted that it was unaware of the beacon until the External Intelligence Bureau discovered it in 1988. While the Ministry acknowledged the data “might enhance the French nuclear weapons capability”, they were concerned about “the likelihood of adverse domestic publicity if the beacon’s existence and the manner in which it was installed came to the attention of the news media and the public.”²⁶ Prime Minister Palmer announced that the data “could be used to assist with the trajectory of ballistic missiles and some of these missiles could be armed with nuclear warheads”, and ordered that the beacon be removed. Almost immediately a similar French beacon was shut down secretly by the Australian government.²⁷

The Struggle over Nuclear Deterrence: 1987-1990

PACDAC closely scrutinized New Zealand’s voting patterns and explanations of votes on UNGA disarmament resolutions. They found that, despite the legislation, the government continued to oppose resolutions calling for the non-use and no first use of nuclear weapons, negative security assurances and a Convention on the Prohibition of Use of Nuclear Weapons.²⁸ The Ministry’s explanations of votes revealed ongoing support for nuclear deterrence.²⁹ Members tabled statements made by David Lange refuting nuclear deterrence and requested a review of all UNGA disarmament resolutions. Initially the officials tried to stymie the democratic process with excuses such as “most delegations are not looking at texts yet” or “the wording needs changing so as not to directly confront the policies of our Western allies”.

Lange candidly confirmed this powerful stranglehold by the bureaucracy on the policy process:

Left to themselves, our diplomats would certainly have surrendered the nuclear-free policy. Their perspective was the perspective of the State Department, Whitehall, and every other foreign ministry whose government counted itself part of the Western Alliance. The test of membership of the alliance was belief in the doctrine of nuclear deterrence. As New Zealand found out, there wasn’t any other test. Being a democracy wasn’t enough, being well disposed towards NATO and the United States wasn’t enough. You had to subscribe to deterrence to be in the alliance, and to prove it, you had to share in its risks.³⁰

Unbeknown to PACDAC, Lange had already tried to change these votes in 1987. During 1990, he confirmed that he had never received PACDAC’s recommendations about UN voting patterns and said that if he had, it would have strengthened his position. In 1989 the Ministry’s explanation of votes about the total non-use and no first use resolutions

hinted at the dilemma of trying not to cause offence to traditional allies while reflecting public opinion. Phrases such as “it is only after the most careful consideration and with some regret...”, and “the decision to cast a negative vote was not taken easily...”,³¹ highlight this tightrope diplomacy.

Disarmament Minister Fran Wilde encouraged PACDAC to prepare suggestions for new resolutions and for rewording old ones. In 1989 New Zealand proposed two new resolutions opposed by the US. The first recognised the importance of SPNFZ and the second was on naval nuclear arms reductions. During 1988, PACDAC also considered ways of strengthening the Latin American Nuclear Free Zone by linking it with SPNFZ.

Finally, due to detailed analysis provided by peace researchers coupled with PACDAC’s vigilance and persistence, between 1988-9 New Zealand decreased its votes in line with the US and UK from 70% to 27%.³² Continued public pressure resulted in an anticipated probable abstention on the total non-use resolution before the 1990 election. Later, National’s Disarmament Minister Douglas Graham conceded that these inconsistencies were the price paid for the overwhelming support received for the UN resolution on a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban.³³

Purchase of Australian Frigates

During 1988-9, the Labour Government faced one of its most difficult decisions, regarding the replacement of its four aging frigates. David Lange wrote that the 1986 Defence Review “had identified a need for a new long-range patrol and surveillance vessel”, but “what the Australians wanted was a major New Zealand investment in military resources... that would be in effect an enhancement of their own defensive capabilities.”³⁴

The option of buying four ANZAC frigates, which would cement future involvement in a reactivated ANZUS, was implacably opposed by the extra-Parliamentary Labour Party and by PACDAC. Two successive Labour Party Conferences passed motions opposing this, and polls consistently indicated 76% of the public in opposition. During the first ever public Defence Review in 1986, peace groups such as Peace Movement Aotearoa and Just Defence helped coordinate public input which resulted in over 4,000 submissions.³⁵ The New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone Committee launched petitions calling for ‘Positive New Zealand Neutrality’ as the alternative to a nuclear ANZUS.

During the frigate debate, these groups and others continued actively to educate the public about alternative vessels and promoted sensible non-offensive defence policies. A lively debate ensued in the media, Parliament, and at public forums throughout the country.

PACDAC responded by requesting a paper outlining the technical specifications for the ships, and the foreign policy basis upon which the pending decision was being made. There was deep concern when Frank O’Flynn confirmed that the government “had had no control over the provision of baseline characteristics for new New Zealand ships.”³⁶

PACDAC members watched with growing anger as the Defence, Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister's departments covered up the whereabouts of what became known as 'the missing frigate paper'.

Infuriated by the game playing, members argued robustly with Foreign Minister Russell Marshall, demanding honest explanations. When questioned whether the frigates were the "litmus test" of the Trans-Tasman relationship his illuminating response contained the following:

New Zealand was regarded as Western aligned. It was fair to say that if there were a rejection of the four frigates the questions would be raised again as to where NZ stood. NZ would be taking its ships' visits policy one very significant step further if it pulled out of buying frigates. The 'free-loading' argument would come up again - other governments reluctantly accepted NZ's nuclear-free status and their reluctance would be greater if NZ backed out of the frigate project entirely. Some were inclined to say that if NZ didn't cooperate on this reasonable deal this would call into question the whole relationship including CER (Closer Economic Relationship).³⁷

PACDAC naively believed that they could still act as a conduit for the public to decision makers. Within a month of the November 1988 PACDAC meeting, and following a meeting with Australia's Defence and Foreign Affairs Ministers, their New Zealand counterparts came out publicly in support of the purchase. Despite this, PACDAC continued passing resolutions, and peace groups and the Labour Party kept up a strong public education campaign.

The strength of opposition was reflected in a letter from Labour Party President Ruth Dyson to caucus just prior to the decision:

Our decision on the frigates will be crucial. The inconsistency of giving the Navy expensive new toys instead of sensibly priced alternatives when hospital wards are closing will not go down well.... A big part of the success of the last election was due to the work of the activists and the strength of the independent New Zealand / anti-nuclear vote. Standing up to the bullying by the US and Australia was the issue which established David [Lange] as the 'Prime Minister'. Saying no to the frigates and then standing up to the bluff and bluster from across the Tasman would cement Geoffrey's [Palmer] popular leadership.³⁸

The final decision to purchase two frigates was extremely unpopular and seriously undermined public confidence in the democratic process. The popular movement undoubtedly influenced the decision to purchase two instead of four. This also reflected how government responded to public and caucus disquiet, and the need for ongoing changes to defence policies. Following the decision both Prime Minister Mike Moore and David Lange promised a review and possible cancellation of the purchase.

In 1992, a *Dominion* article by Lange entitled 'The frigates are no longer necessary' acknowledged that "few outside the Ministry of Defence actually want these vessels." However, he "was sure that the Australians were prepared to cut our military links unless some price was exacted from New Zealand." Pressure was exerted to adopt the Australian Cold War threat perception and the anti-submarine frigates, despite the fact that they were far beyond New Zealand's needs and means. "Our experience reflected the problem

which governments must cope with in most areas of activity. The Government's only advisers on military purchases were the ones with a vested interest in the most expensive hardware." In effect, he said, both the Australian Government and the New Zealand military "had us over a barrel."³⁹

In a letter to over a thousand anti-frigate protesters, long time peace campaigner and parliamentarian Sonja Davies wrote:

*...Even though we didn't win this battle, I want to assure you that life in the Defence Department will never be the same again, and that is due in no small measure to your efforts. I do not believe that the bureaucrats will ever again be able to hold the politicians to ransom over defence expenditure with their view of the world as they have in the last few months.*⁴⁰

The same could be said within Foreign Affairs. The nuclear free policy and the frigate purchase were highly sensitive in terms of military and foreign relations with New Zealand's traditional allies. It was not surprising, therefore, that the bureaucracy resisted many of PACDAC's efforts at participatory democracy by effectively blocking any real movement on some of the key issues raised. They frequently delayed release of requested research, handed out confidential draft documents for recovery later in the meeting, or expected members to read their background papers in three minutes during the meeting.

Despite all this, the original PACDAC became a vital conduit for effective transmission of alternative research and peace movement concerns into the decision-making process. Eventually Owen Wilkes conceded that this particular committee "did a vast amount of very useful work, and had a significant influence on government policy."⁴¹

The frigate and DORIS debates highlighted the importance of the need for Australasian peace researchers, parliamentarians and NGOs to confer closely and share information. For example, questions were asked in the Australian Senate about the baseline characteristics and costs of the frigates. The DORIS details were faxed to the Australian Senate Defence Researcher, and questions were raised in the House immediately. With the establishment of the Australian National Consultative Committee on Peace and Disarmament (NCCPD) in late 1988, PACDAC members could liaise directly with NCCPD members on crucial issues, such as the wording of a joint Comprehensive Test Ban resolution and on the illegality of nuclear weapons. Initiatives suggested by PACDAC could be supported across the Tasman by the parallel committee.

NCCPD was a much larger committee (twenty members) with its agenda originally set primarily by the Ministry. After consultation with PACDAC members, they became more proactive about setting their own agenda, and provided PACDAC with key source documents such as the Australian Defence and Foreign Affairs reviews, and the Senate Report on the safety of nuclear powered vessels.⁴²

Bipartisan Support

While Labour was hesitant to export the anti-nuclear policy internationally, domestic support for the policy remained consistently strong. Shortly before the 1990 general

election, political expediency forced the National Party to adopt the policy and Don McKinnon resigned as National's Defence spokesperson in protest.⁴³ In March 1990 he said: "New Zealand must have the most powerful and well-organised peace movement in the world." He candidly confessed: "I fought against it but I don't mind being beaten on this issue because ultimately the will of the people will prevail".⁴⁴ Opposition Leader Jim Bolger added that "National's old nuclear policy could have divided caucus and thrown the country into Springbok tour-like chaos."⁴⁵

It soon became clear that the new National government felt no obligation to hear first-hand the views of the peace and anti-nuclear movement. Officials must have been relieved when, in early 1991, the Foreign Minister Don McKinnon appointed a very different PACDAC chaired infrequently by Disarmament Minister Douglas Graham. It comprised two academics critical of Labour's nuclear free policy; a farmer who had won a Mastermind contest on 'Dreadnoughts'; another farmer who, like the former, was a National Party branch functionary; a retired Air Marshal; a former National Cabinet Minister, and a Maori Army officer.⁴⁶ Only one of the original members was kept on for continuity, thereby boosting the number of women members to two.

The new Committee was silent on key policy issues raised by the previous PACDAC. They made no comment on National's review of the safety of nuclear powered ships, New Zealand's role on the UN Security Council, UN disarmament resolution voting and preparation for the Non-Proliferation Treaty Conference. The agenda for most meetings consisted of disbursing grants from the Peace and Disarmament Education Trust – a fund established with French compensation for the *Rainbow Warrior* atrocity – and organising visiting speakers such as a former Commander of NATO and a US ambassador. They were not proactive in suggesting new initiatives or seeking the views of the traditional peace and disarmament movement. Instead, the Committee supported the establishment of two new Centres for Strategic Studies.

Dr Steve Hoadley, a PACDAC member from 1991-1996, described how the committee

*...heard briefings from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, or from visiting experts, on aspects of arms control. We questioned the briefers, but from a posture of relative ignorance, and with the knowledge that they were the messengers, not the decision-makers or drafters. We learned a great deal about official policy, and usually concluded that it was reasonable. But we had almost no impact on policy formation or amendment or execution.*⁴⁷

With PACDAC having relatively little influence on shaping policy under the National government for the next nine years, it was left to the citizen movement and academics to prevent the National government from amending the Act to allow visits by nuclear-powered warships as the price for a reactivated ANZUS Treaty.⁴⁸

Although there was another attempt by the National Party to amend the legislation in 2002 in exchange for a preferential trade deal, it too failed because the policy was still seen by the public as sacrosanct. Changing the policy would not necessarily have secured a trade agreement with the US, and it would not be the only concession demanded for a return to a fully operational ANZUS relationship. Moreover, there were new concerns

about the safety of UK nuclear submarines, which were banned at the time from visiting UK commercial ports, let alone foreign ports.⁴⁹ Coincidentally, the same year the Green Party unsuccessfully attempted to strengthen the nuclear free policy by extending the legislation to prohibit the transit of nuclear-armed or propelled warships and transport of nuclear waste through the 200-mile Exclusive Economic Zone.⁵⁰

In 2000, and again in 2003, the new Labour government appointed some fresh faces to PACDAC with expertise on disarmament matters, including the author. This resulted in a more pro-active committee concerned with policy advice and publication of reports on small arms and other related subjects. Agenda items included the health effects of nuclear testing and Agent Orange for veterans; banning of cluster and depleted uranium munitions; input into The Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission⁵¹; New Zealand's role in implementing the Proliferation Security Initiative under UN Security Resolution 1540; NGO representation and policy at the 2005 Non Proliferation Treaty Review Conference; the New Agenda Coalition and UN voting on disarmament resolutions, and the need for the government to promote a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

Some committee members reported regularly on their active involvement in the creation of a Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies in New Zealand; the development of the Pacific Conflict Transformation Network; the Report to the UN Secretary-General on Disarmament and Non Proliferation Education⁵², and participation in a 'Securing a Peaceful Pacific' Conference partially funded by the Peace and Disarmament Education Trust. The committee also discussed how the public and government could work together to highlight the 60th anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the 20th anniversary of the passing of New Zealand's nuclear free legislation.

NGO Advisers to UN Government Delegations

As early as 1985 the Labour Government adopted a policy of including NGO advisers as full members of Government delegations to UN disarmament conferences such as Non-Proliferation Treaty Reviews, the 1988 UN Special Session on Disarmament III (UNSSOD III), and the 1991 Partial Test Ban Treaty Amendment Conference. After favourable feedback, it became government policy.

It has helped build trust and good working relationships between officials, ministers and the peace movement. The advisers have been able to attend most delegation meetings, participate in writing the Minister's speech, sometimes speak on behalf of the government, and have access to classified Ministry documents. This has meant signing an undertaking promising not to release these documents, and an understanding that when "on duty" the NGO adviser would support the government's policies. While this could cause some real dilemmas for peace activists and researchers, the benefits of the experience have usually far outweighed the short term constraints imposed by the Ministry. For many the most valuable time has been spent attending the parallel NGO gatherings in "off duty" hours.

The insights gained from working in close association with decision makers and observing the UN system in action have the potential to give long term campaigners a very valuable future role. On returning home they have continued to contribute by communicating with the New Zealand UN Mission in New York and NGO groups, requesting documents, speeches and explanations of vote. By building good relationships with contacts within the UN agencies and NGO community, on the spot research can be fed straight from New York or Geneva into PACDAC and the movement, and vice versa. In 1988, the New Zealand experience was used to convince the Australian Government also to include NGOs on delegations.

Expanding the Role of Women

During UNSSOD III effective team work between the only woman NGO adviser with the rest of the delegation resulted in New Zealand leading the co-sponsorship with Australia and Canada of a paper entitled 'Advancement of Women in the Disarmament Process'.⁵³ Within a year Dame Ann Hercus, New Zealand's new UN Ambassador, lambasted the UN's top bureaucrats during the General Assembly for not employing and promoting enough women and asked the Secretary-General to reinvigorate an action programme in this area.⁵⁴ In 1994 the Secretary-General established an expert group to report on 'Gender and the Agenda for Peace'.⁵⁵

In October 2000, after intense activity by five leading international NGOs working with UNIFEM, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security. A landmark victory, this reaffirmed the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts, peace negotiations, peace-building, peacekeeping, humanitarian response and post-conflict reconstruction. It also stressed the importance of their equal participation and full involvement in all efforts for the maintenance and promotion of peace and security.⁵⁶

During the 1984-1990 period in New Zealand it was the growing strength of women's voices, demanding input into matters of defence and security, that placed three women Members of Parliament with links to the peace movement in key decision-making roles.⁵⁷ These women, supported by grassroots groups such as LIMIT, the Peace Foundation and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom,⁵⁸ redefined and reclaimed the concept of security. They promoted peace education, nonviolent conflict resolution, and the allocation of "One Day's Military Spending" for building positive ways of achieving real security for themselves and their children.

It was these women politicians who ensured gender equity on the first PACDAC, and who supported representation by women on government delegations to the UN. They implemented the 1987 Labour Manifesto promises to "support a delegation of Pacific women from New Zealand to visit women in the Pacific Islands in support of a nuclear-free and independent Pacific", and to "invite opinion leaders in the field of social and disarmament policy, especially women, to New Zealand under the Foreign Affairs visitors scheme."⁵⁹ Women from the region were invited to participate in two major conferences on *Pacific Security* and *Human Rights* sponsored by Associate Minister of Foreign Affairs Fran Wilde.

The growing participation of women, Maori and Pacific Islanders in the policy-making process contributed to a shift in emphasis from traditional offensive defence and alliances, to disarmament and common security objectives, and more focus on New Zealand's relations with its Pacific Island neighbours.

New Zealanders Pioneer the World Court Project: 1986-1996

Another initiative which helped cement New Zealand's anti-nuclear position internationally was the World Court Project. It began in Christchurch in 1986, proposed by retired magistrate Harold Evans and promoted internationally by key New Zealand peace campaigners. It sought to obtain an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the legal status of nuclear weapons.

From its inception, PACDAC supported it and advised the government to sponsor an UNGA resolution. In November 1988 the committee was addressed by former Ombudsman Sir Guy Powles, former Australian Liberal politician Edward St John QC, and Harold Evans. With a formidable line-up of legal expertise from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), a comprehensive discussion ensued. The Minister agreed to present a paper to Cabinet in February 1989 supported by MFAT.

Despite this commitment, MFAT effectively frustrated the democratic process. After expressing concern about the costs of the case and a possible negative decision by the Court, the real reasons for their intransigence emerged: "The proposal would be opposed by a large number of Western countries and would be met with a great deal of anxiety by them – New Zealand's participation would be viewed most suspiciously"; "the US and its NATO allies would not respond favourably to an opinion condemning their first use policy as criminal – it would be a severe reaction", and "the Australians would be lobbying to stop New Zealand taking the initiative."⁶⁰

A month later the government announced that it would not pursue the proposal. Undeterred, a few PACDAC members worked closely with Evans and others to pursue the initiative internationally, and built up support amongst the non-governmental community and approached governments in the UN.

Exploiting the improved climate for disarmament initiatives following the end of the Cold War, in May 1992 the World Court Project was given its international launch in Geneva. It was led by an unprecedented coalition of three leading international citizen organisations: the International Peace Bureau, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms.

Through the mechanism of a resolution in the World Health Assembly in May 1993, support was generated among particularly the 110-nation Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which sponsored the UNGA resolution that year requesting an advisory opinion from the ICJ on the question: "Is the threat or use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance permitted under international law?" Heavy intimidation from the NATO nuclear weapon states prevented a vote. However, in 1994, in response to overwhelming

public support for the project, the National government broke ranks as the only member of the Western alliance to vote in support of the reintroduced UNGA resolution, which was adopted by a comfortable majority.

In the lead up to the vote, the government had been subjected to intense pressure from the US and UK. A British warship visit broke an 11-year impasse in the NZ-UK relationship. NZ Defence Forces awaited confirmation of a visit by their Chief of Defence to Washington on an “ANZUS freeze-breaking mission” – the first such visit in over a decade. The new US Ambassador, Josiah Beeman, began organising Prime Minister Jim Bolger’s visit to the White House, and publicly criticised the World Court Project two days before the 1994 UN vote. Ironically, he went so far as to ask what would happen if the World Court ruled nuclear weapons legal:

*Where would you be then? Would New Zealand be prepared to be in violation of a decision of the International Court of Justice by keeping tactical nuclear weapons out of your country when the World Court has declared they are legal?*⁶¹

The resumption of nuclear testing by France in 1995 caused a public outcry in the Pacific, forcing the reluctant Australian government to join New Zealand and other Pacific countries in making strong anti-nuclear presentations at the ICJ Oral Proceedings in November 1995.⁶² Six weeks previously, it also led New Zealand and Australia to reopen the 1973 ICJ contentious case against France. The ICJ rejected the request on technical grounds, mainly because the earlier case had dealt with atmospheric testing. The New Zealand government felt justified in having tried, in order to appease domestic public anger and build international pressure against France – which stopped testing earlier than planned, and eventually closed the test site. This helped generate the political will for the final push to establish a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996. Public opinion polls taken in 1995 indicated that 78% supported the World Court Project, and over 90% supported New Zealand working for nuclear disarmament.⁶³

ICJ Advisory Opinion on Nuclear Weapons

On 8 July 1996, the ICJ delivered a 34-page Advisory Opinion on the UNGA question. In a crucial subparagraph, the Court decided that “a threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law”. The judges also unanimously agreed that an obligation existed “to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.”

The Court’s Opinion vindicated New Zealand’s position. Within a month Jim Bolger negotiated a Disarmament Memorandum with South Africa and said he would lead initiatives to create a nuclear free world. The Opinion also helped stimulate a rethink of nuclear deterrence in other circles including amongst military and political leaders.

Although the nuclear weapon states have mostly ignored the Opinion, it has inspired a stream of subsequent initiatives to secure the abolition of nuclear weapons. Annually

since 1996, the UNGA has adopted a resolution calling for the implementation of this obligation by the

...commencement of multilateral negotiations leading to an early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer, threat or use of nuclear weapons and providing for their elimination.

A Nuclear Weapons Convention is an enforceable global treaty containing a plan for the abolition of nuclear weapons similar to the widely acclaimed one for chemical weapons. The European Parliament passed a similar resolution in 1997, when a model Convention was drafted by citizen group experts and circulated by the UN.⁶⁴

In June 1998, coincident with the breakout by India and Pakistan as nuclear weapon states, an informal coalition of seven influential “middle power” states from “across the blocs” – Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden – referred to the ICJ’s Advisory Opinion in their “New Agenda” initiative calling for the nuclear weapon states to commit to immediate practical steps to reduce nuclear dangers and commence negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons. Since then this group has set the pace in nuclear disarmament, and was credited with saving the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference from failure.

Don McKinnon, as Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Disarmament, became the strongest advocate within the New Agenda Coalition. In May 1998 he acknowledged that:

*The finding of the ICJ in 1996 is fundamental in underpinning our [the NZ government’s] ongoing calls to move the nuclear agenda forward and in seeking the eventual elimination of the weapons. We constantly use it as a reference point for our efforts.*⁶⁵

Following the election of a Labour government in 1999, Prime Minister Helen Clark consolidated the shift to more independent foreign and defence policies focused more on regional security, multilateralism and international law rather than traditional military alliances. During the 1990s the National government had increasingly acknowledged that New Zealanders were identifying more strongly with neighbouring Pacific Island states than with the US. They no longer wanted to be involved in other people’s wars, and they did not like being bullied by Australia, the US and UK.

The NZ peace movement’s successful campaign to call for scarce funding to be redirected from military to social needs, combined with the call for positive peacemaking initiatives, resulted in a deliberate policy shift by the Clark government from the nuclear-based ANZUS Treaty to a more cooperative relationship with Australia and other South Pacific Forum members working together to help solve regional conflicts.⁶⁶ New Zealand’s voting in the UN reflected this shift towards like-minded states such as Sweden, Ireland, Canada, South Africa, Mexico, Brazil and Egypt. The UN voting patterns evolved as New Zealand exerted its growing independence and withstood pressure from its allies to vote with them on a range of security-related issues.

New Zealand responded to the breakdown in the ANZUS alliance by placing a greater

emphasis on the development of regional security through diplomacy and mediation; the pursuit of disarmament and arms control; addressing global environmental concerns; providing development assistance; building trade and cultural links, and maintaining New Zealand's nuclear-free status and promoting a nuclear-free South Pacific.

Specific restructuring of the military forces towards non-provocative defence followed. The government cancelled plans for additional long-range frigates⁶⁷; cancelled an order for F-16 fighter-bombers and phased out its A-4 Skyhawk combat air force, and placed greater emphasis on equipment for the Army to enhance its ability to participate in UN peacekeeping operations.

Other Initiatives

New Zealand anti nuclear campaigners – especially Alyn Ware, who was a key member of the World Court Project and currently a member of PACDAC– continue to play leading roles in the international disarmament movement. He and other New Zealand WCP campaigners were founding members of the Middle Powers Initiative in 1998, which three years later established the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament (PNND) which now has over 500 members in 70 countries. They are active as advisers to Mayors for Peace, which now has 2,410 cities in 131 countries. In 2005 Ware coordinated a joint statement by Mayors for Peace and PNND which was presented to the Non Proliferation Review Conference. Ware has also played a pivotal role working with the leading countries in nuclear free zones within the Southern Hemisphere and adjacent areas to link and strengthen the zones.

In 2001, the author was appointed for two years as the New Zealand government's expert on the UN Study on Disarmament and Non Proliferation Education. One of the recommendations in the UN Study, which was adopted unanimously by the UNGA in October 2002, was to “establish peace cities, as part of the UNESCO Cities for Peace network, through for example, the creation of peace museums, peace parks, websites and the production of booklets on peacemakers and peacemaking”. In July 2002 Christchurch became New Zealand's first Peace City. The City Council, working closely with local NGOs, has since developed a peace website, a peace mural, various displays and exhibitions, and presented awards to peacemakers.⁶⁸ Since then Auckland, Waitakere and Hutt Valley have become Peace Cities and Wellington will reconsider it this year.

Other recent examples include:

- The government's response to citizen concern regarding cluster munitions by taking leadership in expediting negotiations on a treaty banning them.
- At the 2007 UNGA, New Zealand was the leading co-sponsor of a resolution calling for nuclear weapons to be taken off hair-trigger alert.
- Last year the Prime Minister launched the new Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies which will be established at Otago University in 2008.

- In an effort to ensure that future generations are aware of New Zealand's peace and disarmament heritage, copies of the film *Nuclear Reaction* and the CD/DVD *Nuclear Free Nation* were sent to every high school library.

Conclusions

Governments are unlikely to develop policies which do not reflect majority public opinion. Frequently citizens lead the debate and demand change by preparing the ground through public education via the media, petitions, high-profile protests and publications.

In the case of the foreign affairs, disarmament and defence policies in New Zealand over the last sixty years, there is no doubt that various coalitions of citizen groups were extremely successful in securing lasting changes to government policies. Significant initiatives taken by government include taking France to the World Court (1973 and 1995); the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone; the Nuclear Free Zone Act; effective withdrawal from ANZUS; the government submission to the World Court (1995); the development of the New Agenda Coalition and the scrapping of the air combat force.

Participatory democracy is the result of a continuing struggle, where an educating process helps citizens to construct a participatory society. In that society it should be the right of citizens to exercise effective control and vigilance over their representatives, in order that the views of ordinary people are represented in matters of government for the purpose of assuring the common good.⁶⁹ PACDAC has certainly been an educating process for all involved; and although its tangible effects were often unquantifiable, its ripples were felt by both the public, whose concerns it attempted to represent, and the decision-makers it tried to influence.

In the twenty years of PACDAC's existence its contribution has varied reflecting its membership and the policies of the government in power. The first committee, appointed at the pinnacle of the peace movement's history, succeeded in influencing policy and thereby sustaining the integrity of the nuclear free legislation. Although subsequent committees have not been as controversial in their recommendations or agenda items, they have also had significant impact on disarmament policies.

PACDAC remains the only formal mechanism whereby the public can regularly represent their views on disarmament and foreign affairs directly to a Minister and officials. Participation on government delegations to the UN has given a few individuals the opportunity to learn vital skills and influence policy directly both nationally and internationally.

True democracy will only be attained through the perseverance of ordinary citizens committed to maintaining the integrity of their state servants and elected representatives. With PACDAC, New Zealand has provided a model which could still be emulated internationally.

¹ http://www.parliament.nz/en-NZ/PB/Debates/Debates/1/2/5/48HansD_20070612_00001019-Motions-Nuclear-Free-Legislation-20th-Anniversary.htm

² 'Government Notice of Motion No 1 - 20th Anniversary of NZ's Nuclear Free Legislation', Phil Goff speech notes, 12 June 2007.

³ Elsie Locke, 1992, *Peace People*, (Hazard Press, Christchurch) , pp. 286-296; Kevin Clements, 1988, *Back from the Brink: The Creation of a Nuclear-free New Zealand*, (Allen and Unwin, Wellington), pp. 49-87. Christchurch peace groups had met frequently with Kirk as their local politician and invited him to speak on nuclear issues at public rallies and lectures.

⁴ Stephen Kos, 1984, 'Interim Relief in the International Court: New Zealand and the Nuclear Test Cases', *Victoria University Wellington Law Review*, No 14, pp 357-387.

⁵ Margaret Hayward, 1981, *Diary of the Kirk Years* (A H & A W Reed Ltd, Wellington), pp. 143.

⁶ Hayward, 1981, pp. 149.

⁷ 'Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: Report submitted by the Government of New Zealand', 8 May 2008, NPT/CONF.2010/PC.II/11, Article IV, Number 6. "New Zealand has rejected nuclear power generation for itself. New Zealand does not consider nuclear power to be compatible with the concept of sustainable development, given the long-term costs, both financial and ecological, of nuclear waste and the risk of nuclear proliferation. It is New Zealand's view that there are other, more sustainable energy sources that could be developed, and that any responsible discussion about nuclear power should be balanced, and include consideration of the serious risks and costs as well as any benefits."

⁸ See Tom Newnham, 1986, *Peace Squadron: The sharp end of nuclear protest in New Zealand*, (Graphic Publications Ltd, Auckland).

⁹ Stephen Levine & Paul Spoonley, 1979, *Waging Peace: A study of public and parliamentary attitudes towards peace and security issues* (New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies, Auckland), 84pp; Lawrence Jones, 'Cracks in the Consensus: Shifting attitudes to New Zealand Defence', in Roderic Alley (ed), 1984, *Alternatives to ANZUS*, Vol II (NZ Foundation for Peace Studies), pp. 35-50; John Henderson, Keith Jackson, Richard Kennaway, 1980, *Beyond New Zealand: the Foreign Policy of a Small State* (Methuen, Auckland), sections I (pp. 2-9), II (pp.20-27), III (pp.38-67), V (pp. 106-116),VII (pp. 212-215, 242- 259).

¹⁰ *NZ Herald*, "N-armed warships 'strongly opposed'", *The Press*, 6 October 1984.

¹¹ See Robert E. White, 'Nuclear-free New Zealand 1984 - New Zealand Becomes Nuclear-Free', Working Papers, Centre for Peace Studies, Auckland University, No 7, pp 1-20; Robert E. White (ed.), 'A Celebration - 10 Years of Nuclear-free Legislation', Occasional Papers, Centre for Peace Studies, University of Auckland, No. 6.

¹² Margaret Wilson, 1989, *Labour in Government 1984-1987* (Allen and Unwin, Wellington), pp. 55-67; 1984 Policy Document, New Zealand Labour Party, Wellington 1984, p.50 cited in P. Landais-Stamp, and P. Rogers, 1989, *Rocking the Boat: New Zealand, the United States and the Nuclear-free Zone Controversy in the 1980s* (Berg, Oxford), p. 64, footnote 11; David Lange, 1984, 'Trade and Foreign Policy: A Labour Perspective', *New Zealand International Review* (NZIR), Sept/Oct, Vol. IX, No. 5, pp. 2-4. Earlier history covering the debate in the Labour Party in 1983 is covered in Vernon Wright, 1984, *David Lange Prime Minister* (Unwin Paperbacks, Wellington), pp. 131-133.

¹³ Henderson, etc., 1991, p. 214 '... it was Lange who determined that NZ would stand firm in the face of strong pressure to change from the US, Australia and the UK'. David Lange, 1990, *Nuclear Free -The New Zealand Way* (Penguin Books, Auckland).

¹⁴ *Defence and Security : What New Zealanders Want: Report of the Defence Committee of Enquiry*, (Government Printer, Wellington), 1986; *Annex to the Report of the Defence Committee of Enquiry: Public Opinion Poll on Defence and Security: What New Zealanders Want*, National Research Bureau, (Government Printer, Wellington).

¹⁵ Statement by David Lange presented at Moana Cole's Court case in Syracuse, New York, 14

May 1991.

¹⁶ The author was a member from 1987-90, and served again from 2001-2007.

¹⁷ There are similar consultative committees in Sweden, US and Australia.

¹⁸ *New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone, Disarmament and Arms Control Act* 1987, clauses 16-19.

¹⁹ Katie Boanas-Dewes, 1993, 'Participatory Democracy in Peace and Security Decision-Making: the Aotearoa/New Zealand Experience', *Interdisciplinary Peace Research*, vol. 5, no. 2.

²⁰ O. Wilkes, "Aiding, Abetting or Procuring - Does Black Birch Violate the Nuclear Free Act?" *Peacelink*, April 1989, p. 8.

²¹ *Ibid*, p.8.

²² Don Grady, 'NZ in Star Wars', *Weekend Star*, 13 August 1988.

²³ 'Black Birch may breach Act', *Weekend Star*, Saturday 5 November 1988, p 10. New Zealand TV 1 Frontline documentary, 'Under Surveillance', November 1989.

²⁴ Letter to Dr. Peter Wills from Acting General Counsel of the US Navy, 24 July 1987.

²⁵ O. Wilkes, 'Spot on with Doris', *Peace Researcher*, no. 26, March 1990, p-3.

²⁶ Memo from Head, Disarmament Division, entitled: 'France's Project Doris in the Chatham Islands: Present Situation', No 655/2/1, 31 July 19 (obtained under the *Official Information Act*.) Media coverage included Peter King, 'Doris may help foster our detente with French', *The Dominion*, 14 May 1990; 'Govt to probe French beacon', *Christchurch Star* 11 January 1990; Brendon Burns, 'Removal of Doris "sets no precedent"', *The Press*, 15 February 1990. See also, Owen Wilkes, 'Doris and Dirty Tricks', *NZ Monthly Review*, 1991 pp 48- 49 and Wayne McCallum, *The Doris Affair*, *NZ Monthly Review*, 1991 p 35.

²⁷ 'Canberra bans satellite device', *West Australian*, March 21, 1990.

²⁸ For example: O. Wilkes and L. Richards, 'N.Z. voting at UN', *Peacelink*, no. 43, August 1996, pp. 5-8; O. Wilkes 'NZ Voting at the UN', *Peacelink*, no. 46, November 1986, pp. 10-11.

²⁹ For a comprehensive study of Lange's critical statements of nuclear deterrence, see Graham (1989); Kennedy Graham, 1987, 'New Zealand's Non-Nuclear Policy: Towards Global Security', *Alternatives*, vol. XII, pp. 217-242; Kennedy Graham, 1989, 'Lowering the Nuclear Sword: New Zealand, morality and nuclear deterrence', *NZIR*, March/April, pp. 20-25; K. Graham, 1986, 'After deterrence - what?', *NZIR*, vol. XI, no. 3, May-June, pp. 5-9; Michael Pugh, 1987, 'Nuclear deterrence theory: the spectre at the feast', *NZIR*, vol. XII, no 3, May/June, pp. 10-13.

³⁰ Lange, 1990, p 194.

³¹ Explanation Vote by Dame Ann Hercus, 10 November 1989, UNGA 44th session for Resolutions A/C.1/44/L3 and L 39.

³² O.Wilkes, *Peacelink*, 1990, pp 11-14.

³³ National Consultative Committee on Disarmament, *Newsletter*, 24 July 1991.

³⁴ Lange, 1990, p.167.

³⁵ Just Defence magazines, Wellington, 1985 – 1989; *Peacelink*, 'On Defence', Issue 37, December 1985, Christchurch; Pauline, Swain, 'Who defends New Zealand?', *NZ Listener*, 16 November 1985. Ray Galvin, 'Considerable anti-nuclear energy', *NZ Listener*, 11 October 1986. Warren Thomson, June Gregg, Doug Craig, 1987, *Old Myths or New Options? The New Zealand Security Debate after the nuclear ships ban*, (Defence Alternatives Study Group, Christchurch).

³⁶ PACDAC Minutes, 16 May 1989, p.13.

³⁷ PACDAC Minutes, 30 November 1988.

³⁸ Letter from Ruth Dyson to Labour Caucus, September 1989.

³⁹ David Lange, 'The Frigates are no Longer Necessary', *The Dominion*, 30 November 1992.

⁴⁰ Letter from Sonja Davies, 13 September 1989.

⁴¹ O. Wilkes, 'Will PACDAC Push for Real Disarmament?' *Peacelink*, August 1991, p.20.

⁴² The Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *Visits to Australia by nuclear powered or armed vessels: Contingency planning for the accidental release of ionizing radiation*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1989.

-
- ⁴³ See Robert E. White, 1998, 'Nuclear-free New Zealand: 1987 - from Policy to Legislation', Working Papers, Centre for Peace Studies, University of Auckland, No. 8, chapter 4, pp. 47- 56.
- ⁴⁴ NZPA, 10 March 1990, reported in 'What the Nats said.... National Copies No-Nukes Policy' in *Peacelink*, No. 80, April 1990, p3.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ Robert White, *Nuclear Free New Zealand: The Policy in Action*, Working Paper No 9, Centre for Peace Studies, University of Auckland, July 1999, pp 103-5.
- ⁴⁸ Report of the Special Committee on Nuclear Propulsion, *The Safety of Nuclear Powered Ships*, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, December 1992.
- ⁴⁹ See Commander Robert Green, Royal Navy (Ret'd) 'UK Nuclear-Powered Submarines Banned from Visiting UK Commercial Ports: Reactor Problems Vindicate New Zealand's Nuclear Propulsion Ban' on www.disarmsecure.org
- ⁵⁰ See 'Nuclear Denizens of the Deep: Can they be prohibited? Comments on the New Zealand Nuclear Free Zone Extension Bill', Professor Elisabeth Mann Borgese and Alyn Ware on www.disarmsecure.org.
- ⁵¹ The Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission, 2006, *Weapons of Terror: Freeing the World of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Arms*, (Stockholm) www.wmdcommission.org
- ⁵² See <http://disarmament.un.org/education-new/2002UNStudy.html>
- ⁵³ The author was the only woman on the nine-member UNSSOD III delegation. 'Advancement of Women in the Disarmament Process,' A/S.15/AC.1/24, 22 June 1988; Statement by Ambassador David McDowell, 'Role of Women in Mobilising World Public Opinion in Favour of Disarmament', UNSSOD III: Working Group III, 10 June 1988; Report of the Secretary General entitled 'Programmes and Activities Undertaken by the UN System in the Area of Women and Peace'. A/S- 15/40, 14 June 1988.
- ⁵⁴ NZPA, 'Ambassador attacks UN', *Christchurch Press*, 18 November 1989; Brett Riley, 'On stage in the Big Apple', *NZ Listener*, 3 September 1988.
- ⁵⁵ See 'Report on Gender and The Agenda for Peace', Division for the Advancement of Women, United Nations, GAP/1994/1 9 December 1994
- ⁵⁶ See <http://www.peacewomen.org/un/sc/1325.html> and <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/wps/> for details.
- ⁵⁷ Helen Clark chaired the Select Committee on Foreign Affairs/Defence (1984-87) which drafted the Nuclear free Legislation; Sonja Davies chaired the Select Committee from 1987-90, and Fran Wilde was Minister for Disarmament and Arms Control and Associate Minister Foreign Affairs from 1989/90.
- ⁵⁸ See <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/wilpf/> and <http://www.peace.net.nz/>. LIMIT was a Wellington based group which campaigned during the frigate debate to change the cut government spending for the military in favour of social spending.
- ⁵⁹ NZ Labour Party Manifesto 1987, Policy Document, p. 102.
- ⁶⁰ PACDAC Minutes, November 1988. All quotations from PACDAC minutes are taken from copies released to Peace Movement Aotearoa under the Official Information Act.
- ⁶¹ 'Envoy urges trust on arms', *The Press*, 15 December 1994; Dave Wilson, 'Washington invitation awaited', *The Press*, 18 November 1994; Hank Schouten, 'Envoy sees threat to anti-nuke law', and Brent Edwards, 'US ship visits still over horizon', *Evening Post*, 15 December 1994.
- ⁶² See Catherine (Kate) Dewes, 1998, 'The World Court Project: The Evolution and Impact of an Effective Citizens' Movement', unpublished PhD dissertation, held at the University of Canterbury, Christchurch. See also www.disarmsecure.org for papers on the WCP.
- ⁶³ Stephen Levine, Paul Spoonley and Peter Aimer, 1995, *Waging Peace Towards 2000*, (The Foundation for Peace Studies, Auckland), pp 90-91, 144-146.

⁶⁴ United Nations document A/C.1/52/7.

⁶⁵ Rt Hon Don McKinnon quoted in 'World Court Project', *Abolition of Nuclear Weapons: A New Zealand perspective*, Abolition 2000 NZ, August 1998

⁶⁶ The Report of the South Pacific Policy Review Group, 1990, *Towards a Pacific Island Community*, chaired by Dr John Henderson, (Wellington) was the first such review of relationships with Pacific Islands on a wide range of issues including defence and security.

⁶⁷ Contractual obligations precluded the cancellation of orders for two frigates from Australia, but plans for two more were cancelled.

⁶⁸ See website: <http://www.ccc.govt.nz/christchurch/peacecity/>

⁶⁹ Unpublished paper by Cecilia Zarate-Laun, 'Participatory Democracy – A Latin American Dilemma'. See also John Mathews, *Age of Democracy*, 1989, (Oxford University Press, Melbourne); and T.E. Cronin, *Direct Democracy*, 1989, (Harvard University Press, Boston, MA)