

NEW ZEALAND'S SECURITY: Alliances and Other Military Relationships

Jim Rolfe

Working Paper 10/97

Synopsis

New Zealand has entered alliance relationships for many reasons in the 50 years since the end of WW II. At times it has done so for the traditional 'balancing' or 'bandwagoning' reasons in an attempt to ensure security. At other times alliances have been formed for more emotional reasons to do with the country's cultural and physical links with the other states in the relationship. The military relationship has been just one in a web of relationships between the countries. Direct security issues were often less important in this second form of alliance relationship.

On balance, the benefits of alliance relationships have outweighed any disadvantages. Through its alliances New Zealand has gained access to decision makers and decision processes in areas of direct interest to New Zealand. It has not had to make any commitments to those alliances other than ones it would have made with or without an alliance relationship.

In the post-Cold War world, traditional security alliances may be irrelevant. However, military relationships leading to networking and confidence building, and the exchange of information and expertise continue to be important. It is in New Zealand's interests to maintain and build its military relationships with as many states in the Asia-Pacific region as possible.

About the Writer

Dr Jim Rolfe is an independent defence analyst and teaches international relations at Victoria University of Wellington

Centre for Strategic Studies
Victoria University of Wellington
1997

© Jim Rolfe
ISSN 1173-5473

Introduction

For some 50 years military relationships have been an important practical and symbolic definer of international linkages and of the ebb and flow of international friendships. That may not be so true in the future. The end of the Cold War has forced obvious alterations in international alignments and, consequently, in thinking about world and regional order. This makes it opportune to re-evaluate some aspects of New Zealand's security policies to determine whether there is sufficient change on the international environment to make changes to a set of defence and security policies which have, broadly unchanged, served New Zealand for some five decades. These policies characterise New Zealand as having being:

- firmly aligned to the western group of states;
- strongly supportive of the United Nations and of UN peacekeeping operations in their various guises;
- focused for most of the time on Southeast Asia and on the South Pacific; and
- reliant on alliance and other military relationships relationships to (it was generally accepted) ensure a large measure of security and to help provide security to other states.

Of these, the alliances, and a range of more or less associated military relationships, have been the most contentious.¹ There have been continual assertions that, variously, the alliances have either ensured or jeopardised security. Both positions can not simultaneously be correct, although either might be at different times for different alliances. Neither position has been analysed to any extent for alliances in general, although specific alliances, especially that with the United States and Australia (ANZUS), have been. Consequently, conclusions about alliances and their utility have often been generalised from quite limited, and sometimes partial, examples.

New Zealand's alliance relationships have been with more than just the United States, Britain and Australia, but it is with those states that New Zealand has been most closely identified. Other alliance states (France, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines in the South East Asia Treaty Organisation [SEATO], and Malaysia and Singapore in the Five Power Defence Arrangements [FPDA]) have played a more peripheral role in New Zealand's defence thinking, although the alliances themselves have been of some importance at different times. New Zealand has been a member of some eight or more separate, although often linked, security relationships which could be described as alliances.

Now there are just two (perhaps three) alliances:²

- the FPDA, which links New Zealand with Australia and Britain to provide a guarantee of consultations in the case of any threat to the security of Malaysia or Singapore;
- the bilateral relationship with Australia through the Canberra Pact (1944) and the series of public commitments to each other's security given in policy documents and by politicians over the years; and
- ANZUS, which gives a formal link to Australia and the United States, although the US has 'suspended' its security guarantee and the alliance operates as, in effect, two separate and quite different bilateral relationships between the US and Australia and between Australia and New Zealand.

Military relationships outside those specific alliances have been, until relatively recently, more limited. There have been military exercises with Pacific rim countries such as Canada and Japan and more latterly Thailand, Korea and Indonesia. As well, New Zealand has a small programme, the Mutual Assistance Programme (MAP), run by the armed forces which gives individual and group

training to the armed forces of most Asian and South Pacific states in return for access to training opportunities in and with those countries.

The broad aim of this paper is to determine whether New Zealand's alliance and other military relationships are likely to enhance peace and security for the country in the medium to long term or degrade it.

Specifically:

- is there anything in New Zealand's past alliance experience which should lead us to conclusions about their future utility; and, following from that
- are the global and regional strategic environments of the next century likely to have such characteristics that sensible conclusions about alliances and their future utility can be drawn; and therefore
- will alliances be relevant in the global and regional strategic environment of the next century; and if not
- what other forms of military relationship could be relevant for New Zealand.

Much of the country's security history of the last 50 years has been tied to alliance relationships. If alliances have in practice had only limited utility in the past or will have none in the future then it will make sense to orient defence policies away from alliance relationships to reflect a new understanding of national security needs and interests. Conversely, if the alliances have been useful in the past or if the future geo-political environment seems to emphasise the need for the kinds of returns given by alliances, then it may make sense to reinforce alliance relations with appropriate states.

For these reasons, there is some theoretical and historical discussion of alliances before an analysis of their utility. This paper firstly examines alliances as institutions made and operated by states for their own benefit. The focus of the analysis is on their utility. The analysis concentrates on the second half of the twentieth century (when New Zealand was most heavily involved in alliance relationships) using as small case studies New Zealand's own alliance experiences, takes account of the period of relative peace since the end of the Cold War and looks forward to the twenty first century. New Zealand's geographical and functional interests are considered in this context. Following from this, the paper considers whether other forms of military relationship could or should replace or supplement alliance relationships.

What are Alliances?

An alliance is a relationship between states in which each undertakes to assist (or at least consider assisting) its partners if they are threatened militarily.³ An alliance may be formal or informal; treaty based or based on 'understandings'; strongly institutionalised or loose; and either 'for' or 'against' some other state or group of states. New Zealand has experience of alliances with all of these varied and sometimes mutually opposed characteristics.

Clearly, there is a wide margin of meaning within the concept of alliance and the definition above is contested in areas. For some, it is a 'treaty relationship between designated states where there is a declared commitment to and reasonable expectation of military action by the treaty partners if the situation with any one of them warrants such help'.⁴ Stephen Walt leaves out a necessary concept of treaty: 'a formal or informal relationship of security cooperation between two or more sovereign states. The definition assumes some level of commitment and an exchange of benefits for both parties'.⁵

The degree of formality required is disputed. Although Walt leaves out the concept of a formal treaty, Reiter emphasises it. A 'formal alliance as expressed in a treaty is qualitatively different from a general congruence of interests, as the formality of a treaty creates tight bonds between the signatories'.⁶ If treaty arrangements are ignored the state's future reputation as an ally will be jeopardised. Osgood argues that it is a 'latent war community, based on general cooperation that goes beyond formal provisions and that signatories must continually cultivate in order to preserve mutual confidence in each other's fidelity to specified obligations'.⁷

A firmly conflictual view is given by Liska. Alliances associate 'like minded actors in the hope of overcoming their rivals'.⁸ They formalise 'alignments based on interests or coercion'.⁹ He argues that alliances are:

Against, and only derivatively for, someone or something. The sense of community may consolidate alliances; it rarely brings them about ... cooperation in alliances is in large part the consequence of conflicts with adversaries and may submerge only temporarily the conflicts among allies'.¹⁰

Stein notes the range of motives for entering into an alliance:

Many alliances reflect nothing more than self-interest. Some alliances have probably been little more than a symbolic affirmation of mutual interests that really need not have been institutionalised and formalised. Alternatively, some alliances have really been coordination or collaboration regimes ... that entail joint decision making to resolve dilemmas that arise from individual decision making.¹¹

Other authorities focus on the way that alliances and their institutions may adopt an international role as both a strategic and diplomatic player in their own right. NATO is normally used as the example here, while at the opposite extreme are the loose and essentially *ad hoc* coalitions of interest as seen in 'the Axis alliance of 1939-45 or most inter-Arab alliances, which were limited partnerships in which each member acted relatively independently'.¹²

Although often conflicting in detail, each of these definitions contributes something to our understanding of the institution. It has a security component, it is prepared in the worst case for war, states enter into it for selfish reasons, there are commitments (formal and informal) and there is cooperation at some level between the partners. To some extent all of these factors must be present to call a relationship an alliance. But there is still much flexibility available within the concept.

Why Ally

An alliance, according to Rothstein, is an instrument of statecraft: 'as such [it is] morally neutral. The decision to ally rarely stems from principle. In the normal course of events it simply reflects the expedient calculations at the root of nearly all [policy] decisions'.¹³ Alliances are formed as the outcome of choices. They are formed because those allying see more advantage in doing so than not.¹⁴ Equally, they may be dissolved as the result of similar calculations.

For as long as states have existed they have come into dispute with each other. Sometimes their disputes are settled through the formal processes of international law, occasionally they are resolved by negotiation and compromise. At other times war occurs, either because negotiation has not worked or because one side or the other has decided that it will achieve its aims more effectively

through fighting than through the less certain processes of international negotiation, mediation and arbitration.

In the cases where war is resorted to or anticipated, states may attempt to maximise their power by securing allies; both to have them fight alongside and to provide moral and political strength for the cause. Alternatively, short of war, alliances may be used as a more or less permanent device for system ordering in which one group of states ally to balance the power of a potential hegemonic state or group of states to prevent it dictating the terms of a regional order.

Doran describes the calculus of thought as follows:

To what extent does participation in an alliance increase foreign policy benefits through enhancing one's own security and through reducing one's own probability of getting involved in war, and to what extent does participation decrease those benefits through entanglement in wars, precipitated by allies, that serve to undermine one's own security and increase one's own frequency or intensity of war involvement.¹⁵

Within New Zealand's experience, the South East Asia Collective Defence Treaty and its organisation, SEATO (1954-72), was certainly formed in response to the perceived threat of China. More recently, it is argued that ASEAN was formed with a 'balance of power dimension from the beginning, by locking a potentially hegemonic Indonesia into the system'.¹⁶ This approach to alliances follows Walt who argues that states ally as a response to threat, either by balancing against it or bandwagoning with it.¹⁷

States ally, then, because they feel more secure within an alliance than outside it. Because of the structural anarchy within the international system, the argument goes, states are forced to attempt to maximise their own strength against potential enemies; which in the worst case could be any other state.¹⁸ This is the Hobbesian world of almost perpetual war interspersed with the lull of peace.¹⁹ In these theories, institutions such as alliances are 'arenas for acting out power relationships' rather than ends in themselves which might prevent war.²⁰ This, loosely, is the 'realist' view of world strategic affairs.

But it is not always some immediate threat which may lead to an alliance. It seems that, for small powers at least, alliances may be joined because of the effect of past individual (good) experience, rather than because of the realist explanation that they are a reaction to immediate threat.²¹ Morrow describes one model:

Alliances can advance diverse but compatible interests. In this view a nation will judge the attractiveness of an alliance by comparing the benefits of an ally's ability to advance its interests to the costs of advancing the ally's interests. When the former exceeds the latter for both nations, they will want to form an alliance.²²

In these cases, states are just as likely to be looking for the benefits (of scale, of sharing) to be obtained by cooperating with another state as they are preparing for the worst case of imminent war. This is the so called 'idealist' view of world affairs. The institution of alliance may, in these cases, merely be a convenient device to allow the wider relationship to develop within a well understood international institutional framework.

Once formed, no matter what the reason for formation, alliances may develop into a 'security community' within which other non-security international process, such as wider political dialogue, trade or cultural exchanges, may freely take place and within which there is not and can not be any thought of using armed force to resolve conflict.²³ If and when security communities do develop we are able to transform the concept of alliance. It becomes not only (or even primarily) an agent for balancing or bandwagoning to derive power and security, but also one in which transnational linkages and networks develop over the full range of the relationship.²⁴ ASEAN may have developed into such a grouping, and Australia and New Zealand certainly form a security community.²⁵

If the concept of alliances may validly be taken beyond the realist view of them as instruments to maximise power, different criteria should be used to evaluate them. We should not focus solely on threat and success in avoiding or winning war. We should also consider the longer-term benefits or costs over the full range of relations between the participating states, and with other states not part of the alliance, as a means of determining their past and future utility.

Not all analysts accept the sanguine possibility that alliances may be something less than institutions for war. Mearsheimer, for example, does not accept that: 'this optimistic assessment of institutions [that they hold great promise for promoting peace] is not warranted'.²⁶ His views are reinforced by Glaser, when discussing cooperation and competition between states, who sees alliance building as a form of competition because, although the allies are cooperating, they are doing so within a competitive environment – especially if balancing is the primary motive for the alliance relationship.²⁷ If Mearsheimer and Glaser are correct, then the potential utility of alliances is limited to their security utility.

It may be, as Keohane explains, that states widen their concept of their own self interest through the lessons they learn from their involvement in international institutions.²⁸ We do have choices in determining how we wish to respond to the international environment. One choice will be in the kinds of institutions we belong to. It will make sense to ensure that the institutions we choose to belong to are not of the kind that are likely promote war. They should instead reduce it through the development of norms of behaviour for the member states and for the institution when dealing with similar institutions.

New Zealand's Choices: Alliance Relationships

New Zealand has entered into and maintained alliance relationships for a range of motives considerably wider than given by the conventional realist explanations of bandwagoning or balancing. To take account of this range, I have sketched out elsewhere a classification of alliance behaviour as being:

- proactive (no immediate threat, peace of mind desired);
- reactive (responding to a perceived threat);
- emotional (where the relationship is almost automatic); and
- networking (where benefits other than security are received or given).²⁹

The categories are not exclusive and alliances may move between them according to the needs of the moment. This kind of taxonomy takes account of both the dominant realist explanation of state behaviour and also the less accepted idealist view. The following section provides some brief discussion of New Zealand's alliance behaviour since 1945 and an explanation of how the alliances fit

within the broad categories described above. Not all of the relationships discussed have involved formal treaties, but all clearly fit the concepts discussed above within which alliances should be analysed.

The earliest alliance hardly involved choice at all. Immediately after World War II, the 1946 London Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers agreed that each member of the Commonwealth should: accept responsibility for the defence of its own area; accept the principle of joint responsibility among members for the protection of lines of communication; and agree that it was in all their strategic interests to assist in maintaining a position in those protective areas which directly affected their own territory and communications.³⁰ The conference rejected a centralised system of Commonwealth defence and recognised that the alternative was some looser system for coordination which should be based on national organisations.

For New Zealand this meant coordination of effort with Australia and Britain in the ANZAM (Australia and New Zealand in the Malayan Area). Under ANZAM arrangements New Zealand was responsible for her own defence, for the defence of local sea lines of communication and for assisting with the defence of Malaya in conditions short of war. Australia emphasised 'their intentions of developing national as distinct from Commonwealth forces'.³¹ New Zealand, however, still desired a Commonwealth link: 'without ANZAM there would have to be some other form of machinery [to coordinate Commonwealth military relationships]'.³² This was a very loose alliance, but alliance it was. New Zealand was involved in it for both proactive security reasons and for the emotional Commonwealth links. ANZAM lasted, in effect, until the 1970s when both Australia and Britain withdrew their forces from the region and may still be discerned in outline with the biennial BRITANZ meeting of Chiefs of Defence Staff of the three states.

If ANZAM was an organisation devoted to maintaining regional Commonwealth security links without any immediate threat in mind, the Middle East Defence Organisation (MEDO) was reactive; a direct response to the perception of a specific threat. The fate of New Zealand in global war, New Zealand's policy makers believed, would be determined by the success or failure of allied arms in vital theatres in Western Europe and the Middle East. The final decisions 'would not be critically affected by the turn of events in other areas such as South East Asia'.³³ Because the Middle East was the focus of sea and air communications between the UK, the Far East and Australia and New Zealand, and because of the increasing importance of its oil reserves, it was highly desirable that: 'we do all we can to foster the successful conclusion of security arrangements for the Middle East'.³⁴

An allied command organisation for the Middle East (roughly an area including North Africa, the modern Arab States to the Persian Gulf) was proposed in the light of fears that the Soviet Union had intentions to move against the region's oil fields. New Zealand was invited to become a founder member of the MEDO and accepted in 1951.³⁵ If the fate of the west was to be decided here, New Zealand wanted to be involved to the extent practicable. The organisation was never, perhaps fortunately, put to the test. Egypt, the major regional power would not join, and there were continual difficulties in establishing any form of proper planning organisation. Despite this, New Zealand's desire to ensure security through alliance membership was clear.

The Asia-Pacific region was initially an area of somewhat lesser security concern as the United States was clearly the dominant power. In early 1951 the Chiefs of Staff had determined that a direct treaty was one option for a security arrangement with the US, as an alternative to either a Pacific wide alliance system or an informal US undertaking not to stand aside if attempts occurred to disturb the peace of the Pacific. They concluded that there were no military reasons for any formal approach

to the US for a Pacific Defence Pact and that a direct treaty commitment from the US to New Zealand was probably not obtainable.³⁶ Additionally, any formal pact with the US in the Pacific might 'hinder or future policy in respect to Malaya or Japanese rearmament or immigration from the Philippines'.³⁷ New Zealand's politicians were less sanguine: "'Britannia no longer ruled the waves". It was vital to get a United States security guarantee'.³⁸

The political view prevailed, reinforced by the likelihood of a formal peace treaty with Japan and against the background of the war in Korea. New Zealand strongly preferred a tripartite pact (to include Australia), but if the United States insisted on the inclusion of the Philippines, as 'available evidence suggested she would', New Zealand would rather accept a quadripartite arrangement than jeopardise a prospect of obtaining a formal US guarantee for Australia and New Zealand.³⁹ The United States was sympathetic to the desire for a tripartite arrangement and proposed to present the proposal to the Philippines as one which merely brought Australia and New Zealand into the same arrangement with the United States as that already held by the Philippines. The US Administration wanted to revive the wartime relationship with Australia and New Zealand and was anxious to move along as Congress seemed receptive to the proposal.⁴⁰

At first, neither New Zealand nor the United States was particularly concerned about the mechanics and procedural aspects of ANZUS. The alliance did not, after all, face any immediate direct threat. It too, like ANZAM was proactive (if with reactive elements to account for residual fears of a revived Japanese 'threat', and later to prepare to counter China). America was more concerned about wider East Asian issues and New Zealand believed that scheduled meetings only added to the number of international meetings without necessarily adding to the substance of international diplomacy.⁴¹ New Zealand agreed though, that given that obligations had been accepted under the treaty, and that as the weight of the commitments would be fixed mainly by developments of US policy in the Pacific, it was essential that there be a formal organisation where matters could be discussed and information sought on US intentions.⁴² New Zealand sought from ANZUS a relationship which permitted more direct consultation with the US on Pacific problems, allowed Australia and New Zealand to work closely with the US on plans for defence in the Pacific area, and perhaps gave some measure of influence over US policy directions.

ANZUS did not develop any form of combined planning or operational capability. There were regular combined exercises, especially from the 1970s after the end of the war in Vietnam and the withdrawal of British forces from Singapore and Malaysia, and there were annual meetings of foreign ministers. Both Australia and New Zealand routinely referred to the alliance in policy statements as the 'keystone of our defence'.

But the alliance in its post-1970s form could not adapt to, and did not survive, a significant change in New Zealand's domestic political environment. The United States 'withdrew' its security guarantee and cut almost all military links with New Zealand following the 1984-85 dispute over the visit to New Zealand by a nuclear 'capable' but almost certainly not nuclear armed warship. New Zealand would not allow the ship to visit without explicit guarantees as to its nuclear-free status; guarantees which would have violated the United States' 'neither confirm nor deny' policy and which they were not prepared to give. New Zealand's subsequent introduction of legislation to ban ships whether nuclear powered or armed and its reluctance to revisit the issue of nuclear power despite an expert committee's recommendation that nuclear powered ships provide no significant hazard has ensured that the dispute has lingered into the 1990s.⁴³

This was an alliance which, for New Zealand policy makers at least from 1985, did not provide security benefits sufficient to outweigh the perceived disadvantages of a linkage with the United States' nuclear capabilities. The alliance could not evolve to meet the asymmetric needs of two of its members and it became, in effect, defunct.

But in 1951 ANZUS was a major issue for the excluded Britain and France, both of which had security interests in the region. Britain and France were included in the short-lived Five Power Staff Agency (1953-54) designed to coordinate national plans for the resistance of aggression in the area and which would include the full exchange of pertinent current intelligence.⁴⁴ Initially, the Agency had seemed to be 'an appropriate machinery for the development of strategic planning for Southeast Asia'.⁴⁵ The members had differing national agendas which led to internal discord, but the main problem for this loose reactive alliance was that it was a 'white man's pact'.⁴⁶ It did not involve any of the regional states themselves in planning for regional security; a subject of increasing salience. The Five Power Staff Agency could not last.

In 1954 the United States, as expected, came under pressure from Thailand and the Philippines to include them in regional security arrangements.⁴⁷ The fear was of communist inspired subversion and insurgency and, especially in Burma and Indochina, of Chinese military intervention to support local insurgents.⁴⁸ These moves culminated in a wider defence arrangement for South East Asia the South East Asia Collective Defence Treaty and its organisational base the South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO). This also was a reactive attempt to block the expansion of Communist influence in the general area of South and South East Asia and the South West Pacific.

The alliance was not successful, even in the short-term, and there is an argument to be made that it did not meet New Zealand's overall security interests.⁴⁹ There was recognition that for political and practical reasons 'there must be evidence of some joint planning by all eight SEATO powers, even though the planning must be confined to innocuous subjects'.⁵⁰ New Zealand was concerned that proper planning occur on a systematic basis, unlike the situation which had developed in ANZUS, but the United States was not convinced of the military merits of SEATO. The most satisfactory solution, the argument went, would be to establish some form of 'inner circle' planning, perhaps on an ANZUS plus basis, but until they (the US) 'have a sense of conviction of the importance of making SEATO a going concern we doubt whether much progress will be made on the military side'.⁵¹

SEATO was never able to match its quite highly developed military planning (which included contingency plans to deal with local insurgency as well as a for a full scale Chinese invasion through Thailand) with the political reality of differing aims and lack of trust between the members. By the mid 1960s the war in Vietnam overshadowed all other activity in the region, and by 1972 with the Vietnam war over and great power detente becoming a reality, the organisation dissolved completely as a military alliance.

The defence of Malaya had been secured through the ANZAM arrangements, which also gave the members a convenient base from which to manage their SEATO commitments. By the mid-1950s, though, it was clear that Malaya would become independent sooner rather than later. The three ANZAM partners were concerned that independent Malaya would not place the same importance on security issues as they did themselves. Independence negotiations between Malayan authorities and Britain began in early 1956, with Australia and New Zealand participating as observers. New Zealand's line was that:

We require Malaya to be secure from external threat or internal subversion in order that we, with our allies can be assured of a firm base upon which to base our forces needed to counter aggression in South East Asia.⁵²

New Zealand would not, however, accept the formal obligations adopted by Britain for the external defence of Malaya through the 1957 Anglo-Malayan (later Malaysian) Defence Agreement (AMDA). New Zealand did wish to be associated, but not to the extent of being a formal treaty partner: 'the normal Commonwealth obligation will be sufficient'.⁵³ Australia and New Zealand determined that their best course would be to associate themselves with the agreement by means of an exchange of letters between the governments. The letters would set out the rights and obligations held by each country, and limit the obligations to those incurred by the presence of the Commonwealth Strategic Reserve in the country.

Clearly, it was one thing to accept a role in the defence of a colony, another to have to give formal guarantees for the external defence of an independent state. But, although New Zealand refused to accept any formal role in Malaya's external defence, in practice it was clear that as Malaya was within the SEATO area, New Zealand was effectively providing for her defence. There was no treaty obligation, but in a statement to Parliament on 20 September 1963 the Prime Minister stated that: 'New Zealand has always given cause to believe that she would not stand idly aside in the event of an armed attack on Malaysia'.⁵⁴ Privately, the government's position was even stronger. In a letter to Prime Minister Macmillan of Britain on 26 September, the Prime Minister specifically envisaged the 'possible employment of our forces in support of efforts of your own and Malaysian forces in countering external aggression'. The Department of External Affairs considered the combined effect of association with AMDA and the Prime Minister's statement to be at least as binding as participation in the ANZUS or SEATO alliances. Malaysia was, in effect an alliance partner; one which received security from New Zealand rather than provided it. New Zealand's attachment to Malaysia through AMDA was in part emotional and in part proactive, as it had been when the country was still a colony.

AMDA was relevant only for as long as Britain had significant troops in the country. Once the British government decided that it would withdraw its troops from 'East of Suez' a new form of arrangement became necessary. The Five Power Defence Arrangements (FPDA, 1971-present) between Malaysia, Singapore, New Zealand, Britain and Australia were a response to the changing strategic situation of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Ministers from all five states declared jointly in relation to the external defence of Malaysia and Singapore that 'in the event of any form of armed attack externally organised or supported or the threat of such attack ... their Governments would immediately consult together for the purpose of deciding what measures should be taken'.⁵⁵

The FPDA involves little formal machinery, the agreements themselves relate primarily to procedural matters and to that extent are similar to the provisions of AMDA agreed to by New Zealand from 1957. An Integrated Air Defence System has been established and there are annual air defence exercises involving all the partners. Until 1990 New Zealand maintained ground forces in Singapore, and still exercises in the region several times a year with different elements of the armed force on what are described as 'five-power exercises'.⁵⁶ Links between the armed forces of the FPDA states have increased substantially in the 1990s and there are continued statements from political leaders of all the states as to the wider utility of the alliance.

The FPDA continues, from New Zealand's point of view, because, as in 1971, both Singapore and Malaysia want it to continue for security reasons, because all countries get military value from it and

because it represents an economical way for New Zealand to continue to demonstrate its political as much as its military interest in the region. New Zealand's motives for participation remain at one level as providing proactive security to the region and to New Zealand's interests in it, and have moved at another level from an emotional commitment to Commonwealth security to an arrangement in which the networking benefits for New Zealand, not just at the military level are considerable.

New Zealand's final alliance, that with Australia, is the closest and the most important of the alliance relationships. It is, more than any of the other relationships, 'inevitable', given the two countries' geo-strategic location, economic interdependence, similar cultures and shared histories. As early as 1910 Lord Kitchener, on behalf of the British Government, recommended that the two Dominions coordinate their defence activities.⁵⁷ Today the relationship is described under the rubric Closer Defence Relations (CDR), which is not treaty based but which involves the two countries attempting to identify areas where they can work more closely together. Even in the 1950s there were statements wondering whether the armed forces could get any closer together without merging. They could and they have. The defence relationship today continues to be strengthened at all levels short of institutional merger.

Although an attack on Australia does not appear likely, New Zealand has always, in its political statements and defence policy documents, accepted a commitment to the defence of Australia. In turn, Australia has accepted a similar commitment for the even remoter eventuality of a military threat to New Zealand. The kinds of activities being pursued through CDR are similar to those which have been followed since the 1950s. Attempts are made to synchronise policies, planning staffs consult regularly and great emphasis is placed on operational and equipment compatibility. There is a regular exercise programme between the armed forces. But there is no routine combined contingency planning for, for example, the defence of Australia and there are no combined operational or other forms of staff systems. In time, defence policy makers will need to consider the extent to which links can be made ever closer without closer political ties. This is an emotional and networking alliance with residual elements of pro-active security preparedness.

An Alliance Balance Sheet

The previous section showed how New Zealand has entered, maintained and left (or been left by) its alliance relationships. But none of this has addressed the important question 'what has New Zealand gained and lost through those relationships'? Indeed, there has been little formal analysis of the question. There are many assertions, although few relate the assertions back to evidence or analysis. The following sections attempt to provide a preliminary examination of some of the common arguments for and against alliances in the New Zealand case.

The Benefits

There are a number of benefits commonly claimed for alliances, and for New Zealand in its alliance relationships. Security is the most obvious. Other benefits commonly claimed are of access to policy makers thus allowing New Zealand's voice to be heard and listened to on matters of concern, participation in decisions about areas of interest to New Zealand, access to technology, access to a wider range of experience and the development of a reservoir of goodwill as New Zealand demonstrates good international citizenship; credit for the future perhaps.

At one level, clearly, security was obtained. New Zealand was not threatened in this period and did not have to seek alliance support. However, it is hard to ascribe that to any alliance relationship. New Zealand did not expect to be threatened. When wider Commonwealth (and New Zealand) interests were threatened in the early 1960s as Indonesia adopted its policy of 'Confrontation' against the new state of Malaysia, the AMDA partners worked together successfully to defeat the threat. But the United States, despite giving oral assurances, in the ANZUS Council in 1963, of military support to Australia and New Zealand if required, chose, when pressed, not to extend any alliance commitment.⁵⁸ One alliance provided security in an area that all the members were interested in, another did not, primarily because the senior partner had no interest.

More positively, the alliance relationships have given routine access to security policy makers within the member states. ANZUS had a regular series of meetings of Foreign Ministers, FPDA has two yearly meetings of Chiefs of Defence Staff and three yearly meetings of Ministers of Defence, and the Australian and New Zealand Ministers of Defence meet annually. These are positive forms of networking and should be measured in networking terms rather than in terms of specific outcomes. They allow for information to be exchanged, world views to be shared and differences of perspective to be understood if not accepted. Shadowing the high level (often political) meetings are regular working level contacts which develop a habit of dialogue and cooperation between officials. New Zealand now has considerable experience of these kinds of activities. They are the kind of activity now being mooted as 'confidence building measures' within the developing regional security system. They have existed and continue to exist for New Zealand with Australia, Britain, Singapore and Malaysia. They may not require an alliance relationship to occur, but the alliance system has allowed them to flourish.

There are wider benefits also. In the judgement of a Ministry of Foreign Affairs historian, New Zealand gained a great deal from ANZAM:

Our national position frequently lost out to the greater weight of Australia and the United Kingdom, but only because there was never an issue judged of such importance as to require that we impose a veto. We could not have undertaken much of the detailed planning undertaken within ANZAM. Through it, we received recognition of a defence role in our own area, access to planning and operational decisions in Southeast Asia (at least as far as the Commonwealth was concerned), and valuable information on the global situation and global policies. Together, these helped to provide the basis we needed for decisions on the development of our armed forces.⁵⁹

And on ANZUS Olsen has argued that:

New Zealand critics unduly discount the leverage Wellington gained by being a full member of ANZUS ... In fact New Zealand was an active participant in ANZUS decisions and arguably a decisive voice when it came to Southwest Pacific island oriented issues which loom large to Wellington, but are relatively minor for Washington. New Zealand's small but routine participation in ANZUS structures and associated liaison positions gave it a presence that was far from commensurate with its small capabilities or potential. In practice, New Zealand was able to shape much larger policy issues from within ANZUS than it can hope to today.⁶⁰

This is certainly a long-held perception by New Zealand's security planners. A major reason for joining the Middle East Defence Organisation was so that decisions made about that area would have New Zealand's input. If you aren't involved you will not be heard at all, is the underlying thought.

Soft evidence for this may be seen in the reaction by New Zealand to several events since the break down of the ANZUS alliance. Canada criticised the US sharply over the invasion of Panama, NZ did not because it did not want to offend the US further following the breakdown in ANZUS relations. On China, Australia's foreign minister Gareth Evans was able to remonstrate publicly with the US over the question of Most Favoured Nation status. NZ did not feel able to. These are the kinds of issues which could be, and were, raised within the ANZUS Council. Perhaps it is easier to be independent within an alliance. An alliance partner is perhaps able to speak out from within the alliance because of the access enjoyed to the other partners. Outside some form of 'special relationship' there is no need for the target of comments to listen at all. Inside the relationship they may ignore the comments, but they have to listen.

Other advantages are less measurable, but nonetheless exist. New Zealand has a high political profile in Malaysia and Singapore, in part because of its continued presence in those states since the late 1940s. Although difficult to measure, such a profile seems intuitively to be of more advantage than disadvantage. New Zealand has received access to military technology and intelligence, especially from the United States but also from FPDA partners, which would not otherwise have been available. The technology allows the armed forces to maintain at least a knowledge base if not a capability; the intelligence on regional affairs ensures that New Zealand's decisions are informed by a wider range of viewpoints than those available solely through national sources of information. These are all benefits which should not lightly be discarded.

Some Disadvantages

None of the advantages, whether achieved in full or in part, are relevant if alliances are rejected as a counter-productive method for ordering international relations – bilaterally or multilaterally. The most common arguments relate to ideas (in no order of priority):

- of the likelihood that they will cause insecurity;
- of the immorality of alliances generally and with the United States in particular;
- that they have or will force New Zealand into irrelevant wars against her national interest;
- that they have placed New Zealand in client state status with the allied states (again, normally the US);
- that they limit freedom of action in areas outside the ambit of the alliance; and
- that they have or will force New Zealand into inappropriate force structures and equipment purchases.

The most serious of these is that alliances in fact cause insecurity rather than security. This is a somewhat stronger claim than that they do not achieve security. Vasquez argues, on the basis of some correlations, that 'it is a legitimate inference that alliances ... help to aggravate a situation that makes war more likely' and that they 'do not prevent war or promote peace; instead they are associated with war.'⁶¹ Other research draws different conclusions:

Clearly, the large majority of wars have not been preceded by alliances ... Overall, the relationship between alliance formation and war ... is negative and relatively low, contradicting the hypothesis that the greater number of alliances in a given period, the greater the amount of war is likely. On the other hand, it seems fairly clear as well that alliances neither prevent war nor foster peace.⁶²

It may be that any correlation occurs as alliances are built as a reaction to the rise of a threatening situation rather than being the cause of it.

A variant of the argument is that alliances may reduce a nation's security either by provoking opposition and arms races, through the workings of the 'security dilemma', or by tying security to an ally's ambitions.⁶³ Problems of this kind occur when a state not a member of the alliance reacts unfavourably to the fact of the alliance, either by increasing its own military preparations or through other political reactions. Alliance membership then becomes counter-productive. This is all linked to the argument that alliance membership forces a state into wars not in its interests. The argument is hardly an issue when an alliance is entered into because of the imminent threat of aggression, but is of somewhat more moment for other forms of alliance.

In New Zealand's case there is little evidence that alliance membership alone has caused insecurity or even participation in war. The only claim of insecurity has been that New Zealand was (or might have been) a nuclear target because of its relationship with the US during the Cold War. No evidence is given to support the claim. Other war involvement by New Zealand has had various causes, none of them particularly to do with alliance membership. War in Korea in the 1950s and the Gulf in 1991 was undertaken in accordance with the principles of UN collective security rather than alliance membership, confrontation with Indonesia was a reaction to Indonesia's attacks on Malaysia and on the basis of Commonwealth collective security (underpinned however by association with AMDA), and Vietnam because of the 'intersection of certain major trends in New Zealand's external relations', not all to do with alliance relationships.⁶⁴ New Zealand policy makers believed (partly as a response to alliance pressure) that it was in her interest to support the United States and thus be involved in Vietnam in a limited way.

Participation in wars, it seems, has been despite or as well as, rather than purely because of alliance membership. Wars, in other words, have been a feature of New Zealand's international relations because policy makers believed that it was in the country's interests to be involved, not because alliance membership required it.

The question of morality has been discussed earlier. To reiterate, alliance membership generally is a morally neutral question. It is a question of how best a state should protect itself. Specific alliances may have moral dimensions, although it is hard to see that any of New Zealand's alliance relationships have been immoral.

'Clientism' does not seem to have been a problem for New Zealand. If a client state is defined as a state which routinely does the bidding of another state and which relies on it for direction as to how to behave in the international arena, there can be little convincing argument that New Zealand has been forced into client state status through alliance participation. The country's record of profound and public disagreement with allied states at different times and on different issues seems to testify to that.

Nor does New Zealand seem to have been forced into actions in areas outside the security sphere because of security relationships with other countries. Indeed, New Zealand has taken both supportive and opposed positions on a range of international economic and cultural issues with no apparent relationship between alliance partnership or otherwise and New Zealand's position on specific issues.

The final argument generally used against alliances is that they have forced New Zealand into inappropriate force structure and equipment decisions. It is certainly correct that New Zealand adopted conscription because of alliance commitments and that its force structures and deployments in the 1950s and 1960s reflected those commitments. But the alliance relationships were themselves

adopted because they were perceived to meet New Zealand's needs, conscription was soon discarded despite the alliance commitments, and the force commitments themselves were, variously, renegotiated when they became too onerous, later ignored and ultimately rejected.

New Zealand has been pressured at different times by allies to purchase what has been (with hindsight) unsuitable equipment. This has been most obvious with the Navy with the purchase, for example, of the cruiser *Royalist* in the 1950s. It was offered, it now seems, on the basis more of the value to Britain to have a cruiser in the region, than to New Zealand specific needs.⁶⁵ It is not so clear though that New Zealand was forced to accept the ships. It chose to, as much through deference to British 'expertise' as because of alliance membership. The most recent case of 'force' is with the purchase of two Anzac frigates in the 1980s for delivery from the late 1990s. The argument is that New Zealand was forced into the (unsuitable) purchase because of its relationship with Australia. It is quite correct that Australia was forceful in its opinion that New Zealand should replace its aging frigate fleet. But New Zealand policy makers were also of that opinion. Options for smaller, less capable, coastal and territorial waters vessels were examined, but ultimately the government decided that it needed a 'blue-water' capability. Once that decision was made it became almost irrelevant which make of warship was purchased. It makes sense to have logistic as well as operational interoperability with Australia, and the cost for the ships was considerably less than for equivalent vessels purchased elsewhere.⁶⁶

Alliances: The Overall Experience

On the evidence here it is hard to ascribe any significant adverse effects to New Zealand through its membership of alliances. There were different aims and motivations in New Zealand's attempts for the alliance relationships. At times there has been an almost reflexive move to ally (ANZAM, AMDA, FPDA, with Australia), at times a desire to be on the strongest side (ANZUS), and at others there was a fear of a specific threat which had to be countered (MEDO, Five Power Staff Agency, SEATO).

The Commonwealth relationships seem to have been entered into because the partners were natural allies because of shared values and interests (Australia and Britain) and because New Zealand accepted a collective obligation to maintain Commonwealth interests in the region. The FPDA and CDR relations have been maintained in part because of the shared values, but also because all partners have got, and continue to get, value from them. The benefits are different for each country, especially in the FPDA. The value to New Zealand lies in the links with Southeast Asia and the ability to train in an environment different from that offered by other states. Singapore and Malaysia probably take different value from the relationship.⁶⁷

Other alliances were entered into because of a sense of threat, not direct and not necessarily immediate, but nonetheless potential, looming and, if realised, harmful. In this sense they were classic cases of balancing behaviour informed by a clear sense of national interest. Where different sets of values clashed, New Zealand seemed to be aware of the factors and able to set clear priorities for itself.

Walt discusses the differing reasons for alliance endurance and collapse.⁶⁸ His conclusions are not startling. Alliances collapse either because the external environment changes and the *raison d'être* for the alliance disappears, or because there are changes in the domestic political processes of one or other member state. This has been New Zealand's experience with MEDO, SEATO and ANZUS. On

the other hand, Walt argues that alliances persist variously because they have a strong leader, because they are symbols of resolve against threat, because they are needed by domestic political elites, because there is institutional strength and cohesiveness sufficient to ensure the alliance's continued existence, or because of a sense of ideological solidarity and shared identity leading to a security community. New Zealand's experience is that those alliances to have lasted have done so because of a broadly shared identity of values and interests (especially with Australia) and because they have adapted themselves and become communities of functional networks in which the security component has become less important relative to the other benefits to be gained from shared activities.

New Zealand's alliances, it seems, have either adapted themselves to prevailing circumstances or withered. MEDO disappeared, SEATO disappeared, ANZUS adapted and when it could no longer adapt to meet New Zealand's needs, in effect disappeared. On the other hand, AMDA transformed itself into the FPDA and both the FPDA and CDR relationships have reinvented themselves and continued to grow. It would seem from this that, without a specific threat to focus the mind, the alliances to have survived have been those between states with more or less common values and where the alliance itself has been able to reduce the emphasis on 'security' and focus instead on 'cooperation'. If this is so, then it is a path for the future.

It may be of course that New Zealand is in a special position. It is geographically remote, has limited abilities to provoke more powerful states in a military sense and thus faces few threats. New Zealand, it may be, does not need alliances and because it does not need them can afford to maintain those which correspond to its national values rather than to those which emphasise threat. There may be no general lesson to learn about alliance behaviour here. But that would be to miss the point. Whether or not there are general lessons to be learnt, there are specific lessons for New Zealand. The main one is that New Zealand has found it to be in her own interests to be allied with different states at different times and that New Zealand has been a net beneficiary through its alliance membership. It is an open question, though, whether that will be the case in the future.

The alliances that remain now provide benefits which could be provided without the concept of alliance necessarily being invoked. Networking, cooperation, information sharing and confidence building in the military sphere may, in the absence of specific threat, be areas to focus on for the future, rather than on the mechanics of forming security relationships with a range of states. But that will be dependent on the international environment in the early decades of the twenty first century,

The Twenty First Century Environment

We know that the Cold War is over. Unfortunately, we do not know much more than that. Questions to be answered, relating to the Asia-Pacific region alone, include the large ones: the future relationship and balance of power and influence between China, the US and Japan; how and when the Korean peninsula will be reintegrated; or the effect of ASEAN's expansion and more specific ones such as how territorial disputes in the South China Sea and elsewhere will be resolved and how 'new' transborder security issues such as the environment will be integrated into regional problem solving processes. None of this is immediately knowable.

There is therefore much speculation as to the shape of the future international system. A working assumption is that the system will, in the short to medium term of the first decades of the 21st century at least, remain more or less as it is today. That is, a system of states in which there is a degree of shared interest and cooperation, but also of distinct national interest and self-help. But we do not know if there will be renewed great power confrontation (perhaps after a breathing space)

and we do not know if there is likely to be a form of regional hegemonic control by any power. The US does not appear to want to play this role in Asia and the Pacific; will any other state attempt to by default? Or will some new form of order emerge?

There are several great questions which need to be answered relating to any future world order. Booth suggests two of relevance to this paper: what are the limits of political community and how should that community be organised; and just what is it that constitutes security?⁶⁹ If some resolution to those questions can be made we will be in a better shape to make some judgements about the value of one kind of community: alliance.

International Political Community

Of the common forecasts about the shape of the future (renewed bipolar conflict, a multipolar world, regional hegemonic systems, more of the same), only two see any reduction in the significance of the state. The first is the concept of world governance, promoted by some, but rejected by most. In this system a supranational authority would assume control of at least the security functions of current state governments. The second is what has been described as a new medievalism in which current systems of interstate relationships are lost under different forms of overlapping supranational, transnational, national and subnational processes and institutions. Loyalties may be given to more than one ordering system (as in the competition between church and king in the middle ages) and the systems will compete for that loyalty.⁷⁰ A system of world governance would of course reduce the state to insignificance and make alliances redundant. A new medievalism might reduce the significance of states, but as they would have to compete with other actors it would be most likely that the concept of alliance would achieve greater rather than lesser salience. However, neither of these forms of international order is likely to occur in the next 10 to 20 years.

Some assumptions may, therefore, be made.

- The state will continue to be the predominant (but not the only) player in world politics and states will therefore interact with other states.⁷¹ Occasionally those interactions will lead to clashes of interest and conflict. States will want to maximise their power to ensure that their interests are protected and promoted. There will, therefore, be a system to bring states together and allow them to consult.
- Asia will continue to prosper as a region. For New Zealand It will be more important than Europe, because of its economic strength, because a significant part of the country's economic activity takes place in the region and because conflict in this region could directly affect wider New Zealand interests. The region is not homogeneous and needs to be approached with an understanding that the interests of one country are not necessarily the same as those of its neighbours.
- There will be threats without specific enemies: proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, drug trafficking, organised crime, terrorism and threats to the environment. All are part of the new 'comprehensive' security.⁷² None are the result of the kind of systemic imbalance of forces which requires a traditional military alliance of opposing forces to correct. These kinds of new threats mean that security must be defined in relation to values and identity as well as to military aspects.
- The use of force will become more and more illegitimate as a means of resolving disputes, but states will reserve the right of legitimate self defence. This will occasionally lead to a form of security dilemma as one state's self defence will look very like another's threat.

Security within the International Arena

This is still, in other words an international society without true or consistent order. Although the boundary between domestic order and international anarchy is a realist one, the answer is not so much to eliminate anarchy by superimposing an overarching authority as to develop an international society in which norms of conduct are such that the maleficent aspects of anarchy are removed as each actor is able to maximise its benefits from international society through cooperation, consultation and similar behaviours.

New Zealand's interests will remain, in this assumed future, very much as they have been in the last 50 years. The country will legitimately be interested in promoting international stability. Without stability New Zealand, as with other small states, faces uncertainty in international relations and in trade. But the stability must be the stability of the rule of international law rather than the stability of imposed peace. New Zealand's values were expressed at the time of the negotiations over the UN and they have not changed significantly since. At times those values may have to be defended and fought for.

Security for New Zealand will, then, be a system in which New Zealand's values are, if not predominant, taken into account in the international arena. A system in which disputes are regulated according to a set of shared norms and values enshrined in international law rather than through the application of force, and a system in which states cooperate and have confidence in each other.

Military Relationships: Their Future Utility

This does not sound like a system in which the armed forces can play a significant role. In the short term at least, New Zealand could perhaps safely relegate the armed forces to the dustbin of history and concentrate on diplomatic, trade and cultural links to ensure that its international interests are met. The armed forces could be refocussed as border security and resource protection forces.

This would however put New Zealand almost alone in the world (in Europe for example, states are clamouring to join NATO despite the almost complete absence of external threat). Being alone is not necessarily a bad place to be if it's also the right place to be. But 'right' is subjective. Security problems are not likely to disappear completely. By discarding its armed forces unilaterally New Zealand would likely alienate the states on which it relies to ensure the continued importance of the kinds of values that New Zealand wants to predominate. New Zealand would have no ability to work with its friends to resolve situations in which the use of military force is appropriate or essential and would be discounted as a participant in the various regional forums used to resolve security issues. These are not outcomes which should lightly be given up.

If, rightly or wrongly, armed forces are seen as underpinning the international values that friendly states such as Australia, Singapore, Malaysia and the US see as important, then for New Zealand to renounce armed force would be seen as a 'free-loading' action and New Zealand would suffer accordingly. If the armed forces continue to be relevant, the question must be: 'how best can we utilise them in the pursuit of security'?

Alliances generally do continue to have a role in providing security for specific circumstances, even if that role is currently somewhat diminished. There is nothing in the possible shape of the future international environment to say that they will not have a more important role in the future.

Perhaps, though, more emphasis should now be given to their wider role in forging genuine links between states so as to reduce the uncertainty inherent in a world of state interests. As such, they

enhance other forms of interstate grouping to provide for comprehensive solutions from comprehensive threats. This kind of arrangement emphasises the process of cooperative activity as a security end in itself rather than through a fear of external threat forcing cooperative activity.

Formal alliances do not, however, have to be made to do this. The armed forces can be used in these cooperative relationships without having the country enter into a security relationship with its military partners. The armed forces can and should instead be used as a tool of international diplomacy in networking and confidence building to help build up a climate of expectation (of good international behaviour) because 'commitments entered, arrangements made, the pooling of intelligence or other resources, habits of consultation ...' constitute a force acting upon the partners.⁷³ This is the kind of arrangement that New Zealand has developed with several states (and lost to some extent with the United States) through its alliances.

It makes sense for New Zealand to work to develop military links with all states in the Asia-Pacific region so that shared concerns can be worked out together and cooperative solutions developed. China and Japan would be good candidates to begin with, as would the ASEAN states outside the FPDA and even India and Pakistan. Initially networks could begin at the level of bilateral exchanges of ideas and concepts between officials, later there could be exchanges of individuals, combined exercises and shared approaches to specific issues. New Zealand would gain in that it would be seen as a willing participant in regional problem solving and it would gain an additional dimension of knowledge about the region and its concerns. New Zealand's networks are not so developed that any one can be neglected.

The Mutual Assistance Programme is another form of networking which brings positive returns to New Zealand and is more likely to add to the country's security than to reduce it. Already the MAP covers some 15 countries. The range of activities covered by the armed forces include, as well as specifically military training, community infrastructure development and medical and dental support to individuals. These activities allow New Zealand to develop an understanding of the countries in which the activities occur and give the armed forces exposure to the region. That is good for New Zealand and for the countries concerned.

Once all of these kinds of relationships are working properly as one link in a web of economic, political and cultural relationships, the likelihood of conflict between the partners would seem to be reduced. If a military threat from outside did rise, the already existing habits of cooperation and understanding of each other's military capabilities and culture would make alliance formation easier. That would seem to be a sensible position to reach.

Conclusions

This discussion has broadened the concept of alliance, and developed it to emphasise the mutual benefits to be gained through combined military activities with a wide range of states rather than focusing narrowly on a small number of traditional allies and on strictly security activities. There are no doubt many 'reasons' why these kind of activities 'can not be done'. But if they are not done we condemn ourselves potentially to continuing with an antagonistic and fearful outlook on the world. An outlook based on a lack of knowledge of military capabilities and intentions and a world in which New Zealand is dependent on a few powerful protectors to shape its world view. That can not be sensible.

A realist would argue that alliances are necessary because they are a means to ensure future security. An idealist might argue that they are useful because they can act as a means of increasing linkages between states and thus help them build up confidence in each other. Either view could be correct. They are not necessarily incompatible. New Zealand certainly has experience of each kind of alliance. In the last 20 years the networking and exchange aspects of alliance have been more important than any security guarantee. That may not be so in the future, but it does demonstrate that there is no necessary reason for alliances to be focused purely on security matters and on deterring threats, real or potential.

For New Zealand, alliances and other military relationships have to reflect the country's identity and its interests, and ultimately must have a role as part of a national strategy for dealing with the international system. Its alliances must be means to help achieve desired ends. Those ends are unlikely to be dramatically different in 2020 from 1990. New Zealand will still want the region to be stable, will still want New Zealand to be free from military threat, will still want the seas to be free for trading purposes, will not want any significant hostile power to be able to exert control over any significant part of the region.

Alliances have their place. They make a statement about how the country sees its place in the world and what it is prepared to do to ensure that its allies remain secure. Equally, they send a signal to potential 'disturbers of the peace' that to attempt to disrupt the interests of one country may be to engage the interests of several others. That is a valuable tool for as long as there are countries which do attempt to disrupt interests.

But security policies do not have to be either/or: alliances or independence. The UN or nothing. These are false dichotomies. A better approach would be to see that a range of policy approaches will be necessary to cover the non-specific security environment of the future. Collective security activities through the UN and other multilateral organisations will make sense in certain circumstances. Equally, forms of multilateral security cooperation and confidence building measures make sense also. They can assist in the process of building a security community; a grouping of states between which there can be no thought that armed force will be used to resolve conflict.

It is sensible to use military relationships for our own ends. We can, through alliances and other military relationships, begin to transform one aspect of international society. This is to refocus alliances away from the need to threaten other states to the desire to establish security communities which will develop norms and standards of inter-state conduct. If we do this there is little doubt that military relationships generally and alliances in particular will continue to have considerable future utility. The specific forms of any relationship must, however, be chosen with care to ensure that the most appropriate is entered into according to the specifics of the international environment.

END NOTES

¹Alliance is being used here in a distinct meaning separate from concepts such as collective security or alignment which are sometimes used as alliance synonyms. They are not synonyms. The term is discussed in more detail below.

²This paper does not examine the obligations New Zealand has towards states such as the Cook Islands and Niue (for which New Zealand has formal defence responsibilities) or Western Samoa with which New Zealand has a treaty relationship.

³It should be noted that alliances do not have a good record for actually fighting in support of individual member states which might need the collective assistance.

⁴T. B. Millar, *The Conduct of Relationships Within Alliances - Problems of Cohesion and Effectiveness* (Canberra: Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, ANU, nd), p. 3.

⁵Stephen M Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1987), p. 1.

⁶Dan Reiter, *Crucible of Beliefs: Learning, Alliances and World Wars* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 58.

⁷Robert E. Osgood, *Alliances and American Foreign Policy* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1968), p. 19, quoted in Francis A. Beer (ed.), *Alliances: Latent War Communities in the Contemporary World* (New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1970), p. 4.

⁸George Liska, *Nations in Alliance: The Limits of Interdependence* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1968), p. 3.

⁹Liska, *op cit.*, p. 3.

¹⁰Liska, *op cit.*, p. 12.

¹¹Arthur A. Stein, *Why Nations Cooperate: Circumstance and Choice in International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 153.

¹²Stephen M. Walt, 'Why Alliances Endure or Collapse', *Survival*, Vol. 39 (1), Spring 1997, p.157.

¹³Robert L. Rothstein, *Alliances and Small Powers* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1968), p. 47.

¹⁴Liska, *op cit.*, p. 26.

¹⁵Charles F. Doran, 'Foreword: Probing the Origins of Contemporary Alliance Thought', in Alan Ned Sabrosky (ed.), *Alliances in US Foreign Policy: Issues in the Quest for Collective Defense* (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1988), p. x.

¹⁶Michael Leifer, 'Balance of Power Quietly Alive in Asia', *Straits Times* (Singapore), 5 January 1996.

¹⁷Stephen M Walt 'Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power', in Michael E Brown, Sean M Lynn-Jones and Steven E Miller (eds.), *The Perils of Anarchy: Contemporary Realism and International Security* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1995).

¹⁸See K N Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979).

¹⁹Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977).

²⁰From John J. Mearsheimer, 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security*, Vol 19 (3), Winter 1994/95, p. 13.

²¹Dan Reiter, *Crucible of Beliefs: Learning, Alliances and World Wars* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1996), p. 120.

²²James D. Morrow, 'Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances', *American Journal of Political Science* Vol 35 No 4, November 1991, p. 905.

²³Karl Deutsch et al., *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organisation in the Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), pp. 5-6.

²⁴For a wider discussion see Emanuel Adler and Michael N. Barnett, 'Governing Anarchy: a Research Agenda for the Study of Security Communities', *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 10, 1996, pp. 63-98.

²⁵James Rolfe, 'Closer Defence Relations: Fashioning an ANZAC Defence Community', *New Zealand International Review*, Vol. XVIII (5), September/October 1993, pp. 14-16.

²⁶Mearsheimer *op cit.*, p. 47.

²⁷Charles L. Glaser, 'Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help', *International Security*, Vol. 19 (3), p.50 n.

²⁸Robert O Keohane, *International Institutions and State Power: Essays in International Relations Theory* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1989).

²⁹Jim Rolfe, *Anachronistic Past or Positive Future: New Zealand and the Five Power Defence Arrangements* CSS Working Paper 4/95 (Wellington: Centre for Strategic Studies, 1995), p. 4.

³⁰From a letter from the NZ Joint Services Liaison Staff, Melbourne, to the Defence Secretariat (of the Prime Minister's Office) Joint/17/3/1 dated 12 September 1955 on file JSO 41/1/3.

³¹COS (62) M7 dated 26 February 1962.

³²COS (61) 34 dated 7 June 1961, *Brief for the Minister of Defence* for a meeting with his Australian counterpart.

³³JSO 42/1/1 dated 27 April 1950, Chiefs of Staff report to the Minister of Defence.

³⁴COS (48) 10 dated 24 September 1948.

³⁵The other founder members were the United Kingdom, the United States and France, who jointly invited Turkey, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand to become involved. All these states accepted the invitation

³⁶COS (51) M 2 of 31 January 1951.

³⁷JSO 34/5/2 dated 27 April 1950. File note by the Department of External Affairs commenting on a letter from Berendsen to the Minister of External Affairs.

³⁸Cabinet discussion 22 March 1951 in Robin Kay, ed, *The ANZUS Pact and the Treaty of Peace with Japan*, Document 240, (Wellington: Government Printer, 1985), p.673.

³⁹JSO 42/1/1 Minister of External Affairs telegram to posts, No 396, 'Pacific Security' dated 21 March 1951.

⁴⁰JSO 42/1/1 Washington to Wellington telegram No 123 dated 13 April 1951.

⁴¹COS (52) M 4 of 26 September 1952.

⁴²JSO 42/1/1, discussion at a Chiefs of Staff meeting on a note from the Department of External Affairs, 28 March 1952.

⁴³For some detail on the process and effects of the US action on New Zealand see Jim Rolfe, *Defending New Zealand: A Study of Structures, Processes and Relationships* (Wellington: Centre for Strategic Studies, 1993), pp. 92-97. The 'expert committee's' report is Special Committee on Nuclear Propulsion, *the Safety of Nuclear Powered Ships* (Wellington: Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 1992).

⁴⁴COS (53) 4 of 29 April 1953.

⁴⁵I.C. McGibbon, 'Defence 1945-1957' in NZIIA, *New Zealand in World Affairs Volume 1, 1945-1957* (Wellington: NZIIA, 1977), p.165.

⁴⁶A term used in Wellington to London telegram No 644 dated 17 June 1953. The telegram also doubted whether the US would be able to resist pressure by the Philippines to be included.

⁴⁷COS (54) M 21 dated 18 June 1954.

⁴⁸Mark Pearson, *Paper Tiger: New Zealand's Part in SEATO 1954-1977* (Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs in conjunction with the Ministry of External Relations and Trade, 1989), p. 53.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 113-114.

⁵⁰Wellington to Washington telegram No 359 dated 10 December 1954.

⁵¹Wellington to Washington telegram No 359 dated 10 December 1954.

⁵²COS (56) 13 dated 16 March 1956.

⁵³Minister of Defence telegram to posts dated 27 September 1956.

⁵⁴Detail in this paragraph is from a brief by the Department of External Affairs, 'Malaysia: Defence Arrangements' dated 27 September 1963. The reference to the employment of the armed forces is to the threatening statements then being made by Indonesia about the formation of Malaysia.

⁵⁵'The Five Power Defence Arrangements' *Communique Issued at the Conclusion of the Five Power Ministerial Meeting on the External Defence of Malaysia and Singapore*, London, 15-16 April 1971.

⁵⁶For more detail see Jim Rolfe, *Anachronistic Past or Positive Future: New Zealand and the Five Power Defence Arrangements* CSS Working Paper 4/95 (Wellington: Centre for Strategic Studies, 1995).

⁵⁷Details on the Australia-New Zealand defence relationship are found in for instance Alan Burnett, *The ANZUS Triangle* (Canberra: Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, 1988) and Jim Rolfe, *Australia and New Zealand: Towards a More Effective Defence Relationship*, Working Paper No. 286 (Canberra: Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, 1995).

⁵⁸Washington to Wellington telegram No 675 dated 8 December 1963.

⁵⁹PM 156/2/4/1 dated 9 December 1971, ANZAM.

⁶⁰Edward A Olsen, *ANZUS and Northeast Asian Alliance Cohesion*, Working Paper No. 86 (Canberra: Peace Research Centre, Australian National University, 1990), p. 11.

⁶¹John A. Vasquez, *The War Puzzle* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) pp. 159, 166.

⁶²Greg Cashman, *What Causes War? An Introduction to Theories of International Conflict* (New York: Lexington Books: 1993), p. 44.

⁶³James D. Morrow, 'Arms versus Allies: trade-offs in the search for security', *International Organization*, Vol 47 (2), Spring 1993, p. 208.

⁶⁴Roberto Rabel, 'Vietnam and the Collapse of the Foreign Policy Consensus', Malcom McKinnon ed., *New Zealand in World Affairs*, Volume II 1957-1972 (Wellington: New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, 1991).

⁶⁵Malcolm Templeton, *Ties of Blood and Empire: New Zealand's Involvement in Middle East Defence and the Suez Crisis 1947-57* (Auckland: Auckland University Press in Association with the New Zealand Institute of International Affairs, 1994), p.124.

⁶⁶Jim Rolfe, *Defending New Zealand*, op cit., pp. 148-149.

⁶⁷See Jim Rolfe, *Anachronistic Past or Positive Future: New Zealand and the Five Power Defence Arrangements* (Wellington: Centre for Strategic Studies, 1995).

⁶⁸Stephen M. Walt, 'Why Alliances Endure or Collapse', *Survival*, Vol. 39 (1), Spring 1997, pp. 156-179.

⁶⁹Ken Booth, 'Dare Not to Know: International Relations Theory versus the Future', Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today* (University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995).

⁷⁰Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), pp. 254-76.

⁷¹E H Carr's 1945 vision of a world in which security was divorced from the state (E H Carr, *Nationalism and After* (New York: Macmillan, 1945) will not occur.

⁷²For a discussion on comprehensive security see Jim Rolfe (ed.) *Unresolved Futures: Comprehensive Security in the Asia-Pacific* (Wellington: Centre for Strategic Studies, Victoria University of Wellington), 1995.

⁷³T. B. Millar, *The Conduct of Relationships Within Alliances - Problems of Cohesion and Effectiveness* (Canberra: Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, nd), p. 3.

Singapore. Taiwan. New Zealand. Mongolia. Since the inception of formal bilateral defense cooperation in 1996, the U.S.-Mongolia defense relationship has developed significantly. Mongolia regards the United States as its most important "third neighbor" and primary security partner. The United States is expanding partnerships in the Indian Ocean Region. 4 Promotion of a Networked Region " The Department is strengthening and evolving U.S. alliances and partnerships into a networked security architecture to uphold the international rules-based order. The Department also continues to cultivate intra-Asian security relationships capable of deterring aggression, maintaining stability, and ensuring free access to common domains. The alliance with Japan has been the cornerstone of U.S. security policy in East Asia for decades, but new challenges from China, North Korea, and within the alliance itself raise questions about its future. The U.S.-Japan Security Alliance. Former U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta addresses U.S. and Japanese forces at Yokota Air Base outside of Tokyo, October 24, 2011. (Yuriko Nakao/Reuters). The alliance with Japan has been the cornerstone of U.S. security policy in East Asia for decades, but new challenges from China, North Korea, and within the alliance itself raise questions about its future. Backgrounder by Lindsay Maizland and Beina Xu. Last updated August 22, 2019. New Zealand's military spending has been reduced for sometime now. Our focus has shifted from defence to primarily peace keeping, training, monitoring roles along with our SAS troops. If we flip it around, if Australia and New Zealand were to consider putting in a military base somewhere in the South China Sea region. How well would that go down? In their backyard? In the strict terms of your question "Australia and New Zealand security" it doesn't worry me very much. If China decided to attack Australia they wouldn't need an island base to do it they'd simply roll over us. We would fight, of course, but we'd be overwhelmed. In terms of global security, however, it's very provocative and fraught with danger.