Assessing the motivations of New Zealand's International Interventions: From Practice to Theory

Matthew Mitchell

A dissertation submitted for partial fulfilment for the Degree of
Master of Strategic Studies, Victoria University of Wellington

Victoria University of Wellington

2015

Abstract

Since the end of the Cold War New Zealand has participated in numerous international interventions, both within the Asia-Pacific region and further afield. As a small state with limited resources and influence what have been the primary motivating factors that have influenced New Zealand's decisions to intervene? Can the decisions to intervene be best explained by realism, liberalism, constructivism, or a combination of these theories? This essay will assess the motivating factors for New Zealand's involvement in international interventions by analysing four case studies where New Zealand participated in an intervention – Bosnia, East Timor, Afghanistan, and the Solomon Islands. This essay will also assess whether the motivating factors for intervening within New Zealand's geographic region differ from those outside its region, and whether there is a difference in approach taken by the two main political parties in New Zealand –Labour and National. The essay concludes that while there were elements of realism and constructivism in the decisions to intervene, liberalism provides that best explanation for the decision to intervene in three of the four case studies. The fourth case study, the Solomon Islands, is best explained by the realist factors of regional security and upholding New Zealand's relationship with Australia. The essay finds that while the motivations for intervening in three of the four case studies were similar, the motivations for intervening within the Asia-Pacific region were slightly more realist. The motivations to intervene were similar regardless if National or Labour were in government.

Contents

Introduction	4
Chapter One: The Concept of Intervention	9
Chapter Two: International Relations Theory and Intervention	19
Realism	21
Liberalism	24
Constructivism	26
Chapter Three: New Zealand's Interventions within the Asia-Pacific Region	30
East Timor	30
Solomon Islands	43
Chapter Four: New Zealand's Interventions Outside the Asia-Pacific Region	55
Bosnia	55
Afghanistan and the War on Terror	65
Conclusion	75
Bibliography	77

Introduction

The decision to intervene in another state with military force is perhaps one of the most difficult and challenging decisions any government will have to make. The practice of intervention poses serious human, material and political risks that no government would take lightly. Despite the risks, international interventions are a common feature of international politics, with states intervening for a myriad of reasons. Since the end of the Cold War, New Zealand has participated in numerous interventions including deployments to Bosnia, Bougainville, the Sinai, the Solomon Islands, Iraq, Angola, Afghanistan, Cambodia, East Timor and Mozambique. As a small state with limited resources and power what have been the motivating factors that have influenced New Zealand's decisions to participate in these interventions?

This essay will assess the motivating factors for New Zealand's involvement in international interventions. Are the motivations best explained by realist, liberal, or constructivist theory, or by some combination of these? The essay will also assess whether the motivating factors for interventions within the Asia-Pacific region differ to the factors that have motivated New Zealand to intervene outside of the region. As a small and relatively minor player in international politics, but also a regional leader in the South Pacific, New Zealand's motivations for intervening within its geographic region may be different to the reasons for contributing to interventions outside the region. The third question this essay will assess is whether the motivations for intervening differ between the two main political parties in New Zealand. It has been argued that the National party prefers

a more realist approach to international relations, while the Labour party is more liberal in its foreign policy outlook.¹

Understanding the motivations for New Zealand's past participation in interventions may help predict or understand the motivations for any future interventions by providing the historical context against which future decisions can be assessed. While no two interventions are the same, and the circumstance under which the decision to intervene may not be applicable to another case, the decision making and rationale behind the decisions are often similar.

This essay is divided into four chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter discusses the concept of intervention, how it differs from war, and provides a definition of intervention focusing on the use of military force. The reason for focusing on the use of military force is to narrow the definition of intervention to exclude actions, such as economic or diplomatic sanctions, that may be considered interference rather than intervention. The use of military force is also more contentious than diplomatic or economic sanctions and carries far greater human, political, and material risk. The second chapter will outline the theoretical framework against which New Zealand's decisions to intervene will be assessed. The three main international relations theories discussed in this chapter are realism, liberalism, and constructivism. This chapter briefly outlines each of the theories, and how international interventions fit within each paradigm. The essay will then move onto assess four case studies where New Zealand has participated in an intervention.

¹ McCraw, David. 'New Zealand's Defence Policy: From Realism to Idealism?', *Defence and Security Analysis*, 24:1, pp. 19-32.

The third chapter assesses New Zealand's motivations for participating in two interventions within the Asia-Pacific region. The first intervention analysed is the decision by the National government to intervene in East Timor in 1999. New Zealand's presence in East Timor was then continued by the Labour government when it came to power in late 1999. The main motivating factor for the intervention in East Timor was to protect the human and democratic rights of the East Timorese after they had voted to gain independence from Indonesia. The National government was also concerned with developing its relationship with Australia within the context of the Closer Defence Relations, and demonstrating that it was a reliable ally that would contribute to regional crises when they occurred. The second intervention assessed in this chapter is the decision by the Labour government to participate in the Australian led intervention in the Solomon Islands in 2003. While the decision to intervene in East Timor was primarily motivated by the liberal ideals of protecting human rights, the decision to intervene in the Solomon Islands was motivated by more realist factors. The primary reasons were the threat of having a failing or failed state in the Pacific region, and upholding New Zealand's international reputation and its relationship with Australia.

The fourth and final chapter will assess New Zealand's motivations for intervening in Bosnia in 1994. It also addresses the decision to participate in the intervention in Afghanistan in 2001, and the 'War on Terror'. The decision by the National government to deploy forces to assist with the United Nations Protection Force in Bosnia (UNPROFOR) was made after a request from the UN for extra troops to assist with its operations in Bosnia. While New Zealand did not have any strategic or national interests at stake in the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia, the National government felt it did have an interest in ensuring

that the credibility of the United Nations (UN) was upheld. At the time the UN's credibility was threatened over its ability to deal with the conflicts in the Balkans and the genocide in Rwanda. The decision to intervene was also motivated by the National government's desire to develop New Zealand's international reputation, especially with its traditional allies after the breakup of the ANZUS alliance. The second intervention assessed in this chapter is the decision by the Labour government to deploy the Special Air Service (SAS) to Afghanistan in 2001, and to take responsibility for a Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in 2003. This decision was primarily motivated by a liberal belief in upholding international law and to prevent the Taliban from providing Al Qaeda a training base from where it could operate. The desire to uphold international law was further demonstrated in the decision not to join the 'Coalition of the Willing' in the invasion of Iraq, but to deploy army engineers to Iraq in the aftermath of the Iraq War in 2003.

The four case studies were chosen as they represent New Zealand's largest military deployments since the end of the Cold War. The case studies also represent two interventions that occurred within the Asia-Pacific region and two outside of the Asia-Pacific region. This will help to assess whether the factors that motivate New Zealand to intervene within its geographic region are different to the motivations for interventions outside of its region. The case studies are also split evenly by the governing party that made the decision to intervene. With the centre-right National Party in government for the interventions in Bosnian and East Timor, and the centre-left Labour Party in government for the decisions to intervene in Afghanistan and the Solomon Islands.

The essay concludes that while there are elements of realism and constructivism in the decisions to intervene, New Zealand's decisions to intervene in the four case studies were primarily motivated by liberal factors. The motives have also been relatively consistent whether National or Labour are in government. The case studies suggest that realist factors may play a larger role in the decision to intervene within the Asia-Pacific than they do for interventions outside the Asia-Pacific region.

Chapter One: The Concept of Intervention

International Interventions are amongst the most contentious and debated subject matters in international politics. The main point of contention is how the practice of intervention, which violates state sovereignty, fits within the norm of non-intervention as enshrined in the UN Charter under Articles 2.1, 2.4 and 2.7. Article 2.1 of the UN Charter states “The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members”,² Article 2.4 of the UN Charter states “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations”,³ while Article 2.7 states “nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter: but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.”⁴

The concept of non-intervention has been reinforced by the UN General Assembly on a number of occasions, most notably in 1965 and 1970. In 1965 the UN General Assembly adopted the ‘Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty’. The declaration states “no state has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state” and “no state shall organise, assist,

² United Nations Charter, <http://www.un.org/en/Documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed toward violent overthrow of another state, or interfere in civil strife in another state.”⁵ In 1970 the UN General Assembly approved the ‘Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning friendly Relations and Cooperation’. This declaration states that “Every State has the duty to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”⁶ Despite the concept of state sovereignty and non-intervention being a cornerstone of the UN Charter, interventions are an almost ubiquitous feature of international relations.

Interventions generally reflect the structural inequalities of the international system. Interventions are primarily undertaken by the powerful states of the Global North, while the target states of interventions tend to be from the Global South, or states that are marginalised from international society. This is due to the power discrepancy between strong and weak states that creates the ability for the more powerful states to coerce and manipulate those states less powerful than themselves. Hedley Bull argued that a basic condition of an intervention is that the intervener is superior in power to the target state, and that a defining feature of being a ‘great power’ was that it could not be intervened against.⁷ For this reason many states in the Global South view intervention, even on humanitarian grounds, as a means of neo-colonialism. These states also fear a return of the ‘standard of civilisation’ argument that was utilised by European states during the

⁵ *Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty*, www.un-documents.net/a20r2131.htm.

⁶ *Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning friendly Relations and Cooperation*, www.un-documents.net/a25r2625.htm.

⁷ Bull, Hedley. ‘Introduction’, *Intervention in World Politics*, ed, Bull, Hedley. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984.

nineteenth century to assign an inferior judicial status to non-European states. In contrast those states within the 'family of nations' were largely immune from intervention.⁸ This feeling is particularly evident in debates surrounding the 'right to intervene' under the 'responsibility to protect' doctrine.⁹

Although interventions have always been part of the international political system, the idea that an intervention is different from war is a relatively new concept. Prior to the late nineteenth century, interventions were generally included within wider debates on war. The justifications for what may be described as an intervention today, especially humanitarian interventions, were debated within the broader spectrum of the 'just war' theory.¹⁰ An example is the seventeenth century Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius who advocated a form of humanitarian intervention in his book *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, but considered this as a just reason for waging war. Grotius argued that sovereigns had the right to punish other sovereigns who "excessively violate the law of nature or of nations in regard to any persons whatsoever."¹¹ This extended to punishing the actions that a sovereign commits against its own citizens so long as the offending was "very atrocious and very evident",¹² and that "while subjects had no right to take up arms against their sovereign...another sovereign could take up arms on their behalf."¹³ In today's language such an action would constitute an intervention on humanitarian grounds and would not be considered war. However,

⁸ MacMillan, John. 'Intervention and the Ordering of the Modern World', *Review of International Studies*, 39:5, pp. 1046.

⁹ Focarelli, Carlo, 'The Responsibility to Protect Doctrine and Humanitarian Intervention: Too Many Ambiguities for a Working Doctrine', *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, 2008, 13:2, pp 202.

¹⁰ Lawson, George. and. Tardelli, Luca. 'The Past, Present, and Future of Intervention', *Review of International Studies*, 39:5, pp. 1236.

¹¹ Nardin, Terry, 'Policy Brief: The Moral Basis of Humanitarian Intervention', *Ethics and International Affairs*, 16:1, pp. 62.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Keene, Edward. 'International Hierarchy and the Origins of the Modern Practice of Intervention', *Review of International Studies*, 39:5, pp. 1080.

Grotius did not make any distinction between war and intervention. There is no phrase or word that translates into 'intervention' in *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*,¹⁴ while Grotius excluded the idea of intervention citing that between war and peace there is no medium.¹⁵ It is only since the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century that writers and policy makers start to differentiate between war and intervention.

While intervention is often understood or described as being different from war, the reality is that intervention is situated in a large grey area between war and peace. A feature of intervention, that may differentiate it from war, is that an intervention does not usually include territorial conquest. Interventions are usually viewed as being smaller in scale with smaller goals than war. States also do not generally declare war when intervening in another state. However, the scale of an intervention and the lack of a formal declaration of war are not necessarily enough to differentiate war from intervention. Martha Finnemore argues that as territorial conquest is rare in today's international society, and that many interventions involve occupation for a period of time or the replacement of entire governments, the difference between intervention and war in today's society is limited.¹⁶ Lawson and Tardelli argue that war disregards sovereignty entirely, while intervention qualifies or temporarily suspends sovereignty.¹⁷ In this respect the intervener has no intention of conquering the target state; rather the aim is to change the actions of the target state's government. However, if a defining feature of state sovereignty is that the state has a near monopoly over the use of force and violence within a defined territory, any

¹⁴ Keene, pp. 1080.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Finnemore, Martha. *The Purpose of Intervention*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 2003, pp. 9.

¹⁷ Lawson, and. Tardelli. pp. 1236.

use of force, or the threat of the use of force is a direct challenge to that state's sovereignty and to the norm of non-intervention.¹⁸

If war is different to intervention what are the characteristics that define intervention? The Oxford Paperback Dictionary defines the word 'intervene' as "[to] enter a discussion or dispute etc. in order to change its course or resolve it."¹⁹ While the dictionary definition provides an understanding of the word, we cannot rely on this definition as a means to guide discussion. Any definition of intervention has to be broad enough to capture and identify the actions that are regarded as an intervention but narrow enough to exclude the many actions that would ordinarily constitute foreign policy. To use the dictionary definition of the word 'intervene' would encapsulate too many actions that are simply foreign policy, that is to attempt to influence other states to do what you want, or act in manner that is favourable to you.

An early definition of intervention was provided by James Rosenau in the 1960's. Rosenau argued that interventions by nature are temporary and finite, and that an intervention contained two essential characteristics that differentiated it from other forms of foreign policy. These were the convention breaking nature of the action and the targeting of authority.²⁰ The first characteristic, convention breaking, was that the action had to constitute a sharp break from the normal state of relations between the intervening state/s and the target state. The sharp break of relations indicated the start of the intervention, while an intervention was considered to have ended once the relations between the

¹⁸ Finnemore, Martha. *The Purpose of Intervention*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 2003, pp. 7.

¹⁹ *The Oxford Paperback Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 4th edition, 1994, pp. 419.

²⁰ Rosenau, James, N. 'The Concept of Intervention', *Journal of International Affairs*, 22:2, pp. 167.

belligerents returned to the pre-intervention conventions, or that the intervening behaviour itself became the accepted norm of behaviour. Therefore, over time, persistent behaviour can establish its own legitimacy despite the manner in which it may have originated.²¹

The second characteristic that Rosenau argued had to be present for an action to be defined as an intervention was that the convention breaking behaviour had to be aimed at the authority structures of the target state.²² Breaks in conventional behaviour, such as a new trade regime, that did not target the political authority of a state could not be considered as an intervention. Rosenau argued that to be defined as an intervention both the convention breaking and targeting of authority had to be present. Rosenau emphasised that interventions did not necessarily have to take the form of using military force, but that the use of military force and the violation of another state's sovereignty is often the clearest example of convention breaking behaviour.²³

The violation of a state's sovereignty indicates that coercion is a key factor in most interventions. If a state consents to outside intervention in its domestic affairs, it is effectively relinquishing some or all of its sovereignty for a period of time. For the consent to be considered legitimate it must originate from the legally recognised government.²⁴ However, during a civil war the task of ascertaining the legitimate government can be fraught, as the complexity of sovereignty and governance becomes increasingly opaque. Not only are there often competing claims to be the legitimate government, but there is often

²¹ Rosenau. pp. 167.

²² Ibid. pp. 169.

²³ Ibid, pp. 168.

²⁴ International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *'Research, Bibliography, Supplementary Volume to The Responsibility to Protect'*, Ottawa, International Development Research Centre, 2001, pp. 16.

increased influence exerted by non-state actors, or militias with their own agendas. The question then arises, does the government, or group that provides the consent for the intervention actually represent the population in the target area? This matter is further complicated if the intervention occurs in a failed state with no government. Consent may also be granted by the legitimate government as a result of external pressure or coercion placed upon the government.²⁵ This could constitute consent under duress and therefore not be representative of the actual motives of the government. A government may also request outside intervention, especially in humanitarian cases, as a means to maintain its credibility with the international community and its own domestic constituencies, thereby ensuring its own survival.

Oran Young defines intervention as “any action taken by an actor that is not directly party to the crisis, that is designed to reduce or remove one or more of the problems of the bargaining relationship and, therefore, to facilitate the termination of the crisis itself.”²⁶ While this definition is useful, it encompasses too many actions that constitute foreign affairs or interference rather than intervention. For example, direct foreign investment or politicians commenting on events in another state could be interpreted as being an intervention. This is problematic in today’s interconnected world where even relatively isolated regimes are interwoven into the international community.

²⁵ Voon, Tania. ‘Closing the Gap between Legitimacy and Legality of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons From East Timor and Kosovo’, *UCLA Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs*, 2003-2003, pp. 35-36.

²⁶ Jean-Sebastian Rioux, ‘Third Party Interventions in International Conflicts: Theory and Evidence’, paper at the annual meeting of the *Canadian Political Science Association*, Halifax: Nova Scotia, 30 May – 1 June 2003, pp. 6.

M.C. Pugh offers a narrower definition of intervention than Oran Young, which focuses on the use of military force. Pugh defines intervention as “a dramatic, abnormal, change in relations between states, in which the jurisdictional boundaries are crossed by interveners using military force to achieve political goals that fall short of all-out war, naked conquest and annexation. It protects statism but seeks changes in government policy.”²⁷ Pugh’s definition utilises the concepts developed by Rosenau but focuses the attention of an intervention solely on military force. This helps clarify the definition and eliminates actions that could be considered as normal forms of foreign policy. Pugh’s definition also provides a very clear indication of when an intervention has occurred, and focuses on the violation of another state’s sovereignty. To focus the rest of the essay we will use the definition that Pugh provides focusing on the use of military force.

Despite their coercive nature and ability to amount to ‘structural violence’ diplomatic and economic activities are excluded from the definition for the following reasons. First, many of the actions that could be defined as diplomatic intervention simply fall under the general category of foreign policy, that is, to try and make another state do what you want them to do.²⁸ To include them would provide a definition that is too unwieldy and cumbersome. Second, diplomatic efforts to resolve a crisis or modify the behaviour of another state do not carry the same political and economic risks as a military intervention.²⁹ Military interventions are generally more controversial, visible, and costly in both economic and political terms. In comparison to diplomatic interventions, the additional

²⁷ Pugh, M C. ‘International Intervention’, in UNESCO, *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*. Section 2.3.

²⁸ Hoffman, Stanley. ‘The Problem of Intervention’, *Intervention in World Politics*, ed, Bull, Hedley. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984. pp. 9.

²⁹ Regan, Patrick. ‘Choosing to Intervene: Outside Intervention in Internal Conflicts’, *The Journal of Politics*, 60:3, pp. 757.

costs and risks associated with military intervention create a different set of criteria on which the decision-making calculus is based. The potential fallout and loss of reputation are generally less when intervening diplomatically. It is also more difficult to withdraw from a military intervention than it is to extricate oneself from a diplomatic intervention or interference. Thirdly, diplomatic interventions are often targeted at maintaining the status quo.³⁰ Although interventions using military force can also be used to maintain the status quo, they usually aim to materially change the circumstances on the ground. The sharp break from normality that military interventions represent is also a key differentiating factor between diplomatic interventions and interventions using military force. Fourth, unless there is significant time pressure to act, diplomatic and/or economic interventions usually occur before states resort to a more visible, costly and destructive military intervention.³¹ The use of military personnel for disaster relief operations is also not included in the definition of intervention. This is because the armed forces are being used for their logistical and technical skills, not their fighting capabilities. They are normally deployed only after a request from the effected state and are not deployed to change the politics or behaviour of the target state.

One problem with the definition of intervention based on the use of force is where the use of clandestine operations fits within the definition? The support of rebels, through training or financial aid, or the use of a proxy to fight your battles could have a significant effect in the target state. However, the intervening state could exercise plausible deniability and argue that their actions do not break the principle of non-intervention as their forces have not breached the sovereign territory of the target state. This essentially blurs the lines

³⁰ Regan. pp. 757.

³¹ Pugh. Section 2.2.

of intervention and while a good argument could be made that clandestine operations should be included in a definition of intervention, it is often difficult to prove any allegations. As this essay will assess New Zealand's motivations for involvement in interventions, and New Zealand is not known for its clandestine operations it is unnecessary to include clandestine operations in the definition.

Chapter Two: International Relations Theory and Intervention

The reasons and motivations why states choose to intervene in other states are as numerous as the number of interventions. For example, states may choose to intervene to advance their own economic or strategic interests,³² to protect civilians from egregious human rights abuses,³³ to prevent refugees from a neighbouring civil war flowing into their territory, to uphold international security and stability, or to support international norms. Other factors such as state identity and the perception each state has of its role and position in international politics may also influence the decision to participate in an intervention.³⁴ Despite the wide range of reasons a state may choose a policy of intervention, the decision can usually be explained by one of the main theories of international relations. This does not mean that all interventions fall neatly into one theory or another, but that the dominant thinking can be best explained using one paradigm. The next section will briefly outline each of the three main theories in international relations – realism, liberalism, and constructivism – and how each theory can explain the motivations for why states choose to intervene in another state.

Before addressing the theoretical perspective of why states choose to intervene it is worth noting that states will usually only intervene when certain conditions are met, regardless of whether the rationale for intervening is based in realist, liberal, or constructivist thinking. Not all of the following conditions have to be present, but it is

³² Morgenthau, Hans J. 'To Intervene or not to Intervene', *Foreign Affairs*, April 1967, 45, pp. 425-436.

³³ International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 'The Responsibility to Protect', International Development Research Centre, 2001.

³⁴ Finnemore, Martha. 'Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention', *The Culture of National Security*, ed. Katzenstein, Peter J, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996. pp. 153-185.

reasonable to assume that at least one of the following conditions would be present in the decision to intervene militarily in another state.

The first condition is that there must be a reasonable chance of success in achieving the goals of the intervention.³⁵ It is highly unlikely that any state would embark on a policy of intervention if there was a high, or even moderate, probability of failure from the outset. The human, political and material costs of a failed intervention could have a significant impact on any government or state. Governments could be voted out of office, the cost of the intervention could contribute to economic recession, or the reputational damage could impact a state's ability to function as effectively as possible on the international stage. A failed intervention can also influence the discourse on intervention and have consequences for any future interventions. This can most readily be seen in the deliberations in the United States about intervening in Bosnia and Rwanda, where the failed intervention in Somalia loomed over the decision making process.³⁶ This was despite the humanitarian situation being worse in both Rwanda and Bosnia than it was in Somalia.

The second condition is that the proposed timeframe for completion of an intervention would normally be short.³⁷ Decision makers will generally steer away from any intervention if an extended engagement is likely. The longer an intervention continues, the more the material and political costs for the government increase, while the benefits would either remain the same or decrease.

³⁵ Regan. pp. 757.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

The third condition is the presence of clear goals. Having a clear goal is important to ensure a short time frame and assist the intervener in not being dragged into a larger conflagration, or into areas such as state building that were not the original intention of the intervention. History is replete with longwinded interventions that suffered greatly from mission creep. However, once an intervention has commenced the goals may become more fluid in response to changing events on the ground. This does not necessarily mean that the original decision to intervene did not have a clear goal, rather that the goals can change over time.

The fourth condition is that there is a degree of domestic and or international support for the intervention.³⁸ Without domestic support the constituency costs could outweigh the potential benefits of the intervention. While the political costs on the international stage for an intervention with no international support could be significant for the intervener.

Realism

Realism depicts international relations as a nasty environment where states struggle for survival in an anarchic world, and conflict between states is inevitable. Although realism is not a unified theory and has many different strands, the key concept of realism is the attainment of power, both militarily and economic, by states. In the absence of an overarching governing body in international society each state strives to maximise its own power relative to other actors to ensure its own survival. As each state acts in a self-

³⁸ Regan. pp. 758.

interested and selfish manner, realism is generally pessimistic about the prospects of peace in the international system. Structural realists, like Kenneth Waltz, focus on the structure of the international system that forces states to act in a selfish manner.³⁹ Due to the perceived constraints of the international system, realists view state interests as relatively static and that all states have the same primary goal – survival. Because states have the same goal, realism views states as undifferentiated actors who will act in a similar manner depending on their power capabilities. Realist theory also views the international environment as largely devoid of any cultural aspects, for this reason realists focus on material concepts such as power.⁴⁰

The realist perception of international politics asserts that international cooperation is difficult to develop and is generally pessimistic about the chances of successful cooperation. Cooperation is further diminished in areas that are vital to a state's survival such as security cooperation.⁴¹ Realists argue that international institutions cannot substantially affect the international system and that they are secondary to the power distributions within the system. Furthermore, international institutions are designed to help the interests of the most powerful states, who only abide by the rules and international norms when it suits them. This decreases the efficacy of these institutions and reduces the role that small states can play in international politics. It is argued that the norms and ideas

³⁹ Waltz, Kenneth. *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1979.

⁴⁰ Katzenstein, Peter J. *The Culture of National Security*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996. pp. 33.

⁴¹ Kang, Taek Goo. 'Assessing China's approach to regional multilateral security cooperation', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 64:4. pp. 408.

of less powerful states cannot change the nature of the international system, because they do not have enough power to impact any change.⁴²

From a realist perspective, states would only choose to intervene in another state if their key state interests were at risk, or if intervention would further their state power and security. Hans Morgenthau argued that a state should only intervene when its interests are at stake and only when there is a reasonable chance of success. Morgenthau stated that “all nations will continue to be guided in their decisions to intervene and their choice of means of intervention by what they regard as their respective national interests.”⁴³ Morgenthau argued that states should not intervene based on ideological grounds or reasons other than state interests, as intervening on ideological grounds reduces the chances for a successful intervention. Morgenthau pointed out that during the Cold War the United States intervened regularly, but often with little success. Conversely, if a state only intervened when its national interests were at stake then it would intervene less often but with more success.⁴⁴ From a realist perspective an intervention could also be prompted by a rival state intervening in another state, or the perception that a rival may intervene in another state.⁴⁵ In this scenario a state would be acting to prevent a rival state from gaining an advantage or to disrupt the rival’s intervention.

One major limitation with the realist view of international relations and intervention is that realism does not adequately explain humanitarian intervention or peace keeping

⁴² Garofano, John. ‘Power, Institutions, and the ASEAN Regional Forum: A Security Community for Asia?’, *Asian Survey*, 42:3, pp. 505.

⁴³ Morgenthau. pp. 430.

⁴⁴ Ibid. 425-436.

⁴⁵ Mitchell, C.R. ‘Civil Strife and the Involvement of External Parties’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 4:2, pp. 172.

missions. While some interventions may be motivated by power and state interests, the majority of humanitarian interventions take place in states that offer little strategic or economic interest to the intervening state/s. The fact that intervening states expend large amounts of material and human resources, and risk significant political fallout if the intervention fails, for very little in the way of increasing their own state's interests indicates that states do not always act in the selfish manner prescribed by the realist paradigm.

Liberalism

Liberalism, like realism, views conflict as inherent in the international system but, unlike realism, views states as rational actors and identifies several ways to mitigate the conflictive nature of international politics.⁴⁶ Liberalism asserts that international peace and stability can be best achieved through the promotion of international law, increased economic interdependency, international organisations and the spread of democracy. The expansion of human rights, the rule of law and the self-determination of the world's people are also key ideals of liberalism. By focusing on the possibility of cooperation between states liberalism is more optimistic about the chances of peace and security in international politics than realism.

Liberalism argues that the more common interests that exist between states the greater the possibility of cooperation and stability in international politics. For example, increased economic interdependency will reduce the likelihood of conflict, as conflict would threaten the economic prosperity of the states involved. As international economic

⁴⁶ Walt, Stephen. M. 'International Relations: One World, Many Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 110, pp 30.

interdependency deepens, a conflict may also affect other states not directly party to the conflict. For this reason the international community may cooperate to actively defuse any conflict before it can impact the wider prosperity of the international community. Liberalism focuses on the idea that cooperation can be garnered through international organisations, such as the UN and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). These multilateral organisations can encourage states to sacrifice short term gains for the longer term benefits provided by ongoing cooperation and the stability this brings.⁴⁷ Liberalism also argues that international security can be best developed through 'common security'. 'Common security' is the idea that cooperation, rather than competition, between states provides the best form of security in international relations.⁴⁸ This contrasts to the realist idea that states will secure their security individually or through 'collective security', where states combine forces in alliances to produce a deterrent threat greater than their individual capabilities.

The spread of democracy and the 'democratic peace theory' are also key tenets of liberalism. The 'democratic peace theory' is based upon the assumption that democratic states are less prone to conflict than non-democratic states or authoritarian states.⁴⁹ The theory holds that liberal democracies do not fight each other, therefore the spread of liberal ideals such as the free market and democracy will mitigate the risk of conflict in the international system. This is despite the fact that research has shown that states that are

⁴⁷ Ibid, pp. 32.

⁴⁸ McCraw, David. 'New Zealand's Defence Policy: From Realism to Idealism?', *Defence and Security Analysis*, 24:1, pp. 26-27.

⁴⁹ Wilson, James Lindley, and Monten, Johnathan. 'Does Kant Justify Liberal Intervention?', *The Review of Politics*, 73, pp. 634.

transitioning to democracy often have a higher chance of conflict than authoritarian or non-democratic regimes.⁵⁰

In contrast to realism, where a decision to intervene would be primarily based on furthering state interests, liberal interventions may be motivated by factors that do not advance a state's direct material interests. This does not mean that state interests do not enter into the decision making calculus, but that short term state interests may not be the overriding factor.

Liberal interventions are often humanitarian in nature, with the aim to protect vulnerable groups from egregious harm committed by their government or warring factions of a civil war. Since the end of the Cold War the international community has launched a number of interventions ostensibly based on humanitarian grounds. The fact that these interventions often take place in states of little strategic or economic importance indicates that the intervening states are not motivated by furthering or protecting their state interests. Interventions on liberal grounds may also focus on state building and the development of liberal ideals such as the free market and democracy.

Constructivism

The constructivist paradigm views international relations through a sociological lens. Unlike realism and liberalism that are essentialist in their international relations outlook, constructivism is a contingent view, in that international society is how states construct it.

⁵⁰ Snyder, Jack L. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*, Norton, New York, 2000.

Constructivism places importance on ideas, norms, values and identity. Constructivism does not dismiss material factors such as power in explaining state behaviour, but has found the focus on material factors to be inadequate to properly assess the reasons for state behaviour.⁵¹ Constructivist theory views states as social actors who through interactions with other states develop shared norms, ideas, and possibly shared identities. Peter Katzenstein defines a norm as the “collective expectations for the proper behaviour of actors within a given identity.”⁵² The normative context of international society helps shape the interests and actions of states, and assists in making dissimilar states act in a similar fashion.⁵³ In this respect state behaviour is driven, to a certain extent, by adherence to international norms or laws not solely based on a cost benefit analysis of each and every situation. Busse argues that we do not stop and make calculations for every decision to ascertain the most beneficial course of action. Instead we generally adhere to the dominant social and cultural norms of the time.⁵⁴ As ideas, debates, identities and norms change over time constructivist theory views the international order as more fluid than either the realism or liberalism.

The role of identity and a state’s self conception is a key aspect of constructivism. A state’s identity and self conception play a significant role in determining the manner in which a state behaves, and can direct the decision making process of the elites in each state. Bulent Aras and Aylin Gorener define national role conceptions as “policy makers’

⁵¹ Peou, Sorpong. ‘Constructivism in Security Studies on Pacific Asia: Assessing Its Strengths and Weaknesses’, *Pacific focus*, 17:2, pp. 180.

⁵² Katzenstein, Peter J. ‘Introduction: Alternative Perspectives on National Security’, *The Culture of National Security*, ed. Katzenstein, Peter J, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996. pp. 5.

⁵³ Finnemore, Martha. ‘Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention’, *The Culture of National Security*, ed. Katzenstein, Peter J, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996. pp. 153-154.

⁵⁴ Busse, Nikolas. ‘Constructivism and Southeast Asian Security’, *The Pacific Review*, 12:1, pp. 44.

understanding of what their nation stands for in the international arena. They are the sources of norms and standards that pattern government actions and responses under different circumstances.”⁵⁵ The foreign policy preferences of states can often be linked back to the political, cultural and personal experiences and characteristics of the elites in the formative stages of the state. These experiences and characteristics may help shape and define the foreign policy approach each state adopts. Self conception and identity reflect what a state believes in and what it is willing to stand up for. For example, if a state views itself as being an active member of the international community and has historically participated in international interventions to protect human rights they may feel more obliged to participate in any future intervention than a state that does not have the same history. A state’s self conception is also reflected by the way other states perceive that state. Other states will expect certain states to behave in a particular manner based on historical patterns. In this regard the historical context of each state may be a significant influence on any decision to intervene or not.

Constructivism argues that while some interventions can be best explained through a realist or liberal internationalist paradigm, neither perspective provides a satisfactory explanation for interventions on humanitarian grounds. Like liberalism, constructivism argues that many interventions occur in states that offer very little strategically or economically to the intervening states. Interventions also take place where the intervening parties do not attempt to construct a liberal democracy in the target state. An example often provided in the literature, where realist or liberal arguments cannot reconcile with the

⁵⁵ Aras, Bulent. and Gorener, Aylin. ‘National Role Conceptions and Foreign Policy Orientation: The Ideational Bases of the Justice and Development Party’s Foreign Policy Activism in the Middle East’, *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 12:1, pp. 81.

actions of the intervening states, is the United States led intervention in Somalia in 1992.⁵⁶

At the time, Somalia was a failing state that offered little to no geostrategic or economic interest to the intervening states. The intervention did not aim to create a liberal democracy or market but was launched based on humanitarian grounds. While this is only one example, the international community has intervened on humanitarian grounds numerous times since the end of the Cold War.

From a constructivist point of view the decision to intervene can be attributed to the international norms surrounding intervention. As norms influence state behaviour, changing attitudes towards intervention have had an impact on decision makers and their choices to commit military forces to interventions. States now intervene in circumstances when previously they would not have intervened. They also do not intervene when they previously would have. For example, until the early twentieth century intervention to collect outstanding debts was considered an acceptable practice in international society⁵⁷ but intervening on humanitarian grounds was not considered a norm. The increased willingness to intervene when a state cannot or is unwilling to protect its citizens reflects a change in international norms and expectations surrounding state behaviour and intervention. This emerging norm is best encapsulated by the 'responsibility to protect' doctrine that was formulated in 2001 and accepted by the international community at the World Summit in 2005.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Finnemore, Martha. 'Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention', *The Culture of National Security*, ed. Katzenstein, Peter J, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996. pp. 154.

⁵⁷ Finnemore, Martha. *The Purpose of Intervention*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 2003, pp. 26.

⁵⁸ 2005 World Summit Outcome, www.un.org/womenwatch/ods/A-RES-60-1-E.pdf.

Chapter Three: New Zealand's Interventions within the Asia-Pacific Region

East Timor

The former Portuguese colony of East Timor was invaded by Indonesia in December 1975. The invading Indonesian force was brutal, with troops committing massacres and killing thousands of unarmed civilians indiscriminately. In July 1976, East Timor was annexed as an Indonesian province. However, only Australia officially recognised Indonesian sovereignty over East Timor. Over the next 25 years the East Timorese would be subjected to harsh Indonesian military rule that would claim the lives of an estimated 200,000 East Timorese civilians and resistance fighters.⁵⁹ This represented around 30 per cent of the East Timorese population and has been referred to as genocide. Until 1999 the international community did little to help assist the East Timorese, and in some cases facilitated Indonesia's continued presence.

In the late 1990's Indonesia was badly affected by the Asian Financial Crisis. The Asian Financial Crisis was a catalyst for the social unrest that led to the eventual downfall of the Suharto regime, and change in Indonesia's policy towards East Timor. On 9 June 1998, Indonesia's interim President, Dr Bucharuddin Jusuf Habibie, announced that he was willing to offer East Timor 'special status' while remaining within the sovereignty of Indonesia.⁶⁰ On 27 January 1999, President Habibie went further and stated that if the East Timorese voted

⁵⁹ Goff, Phil. 'East Timor: Lessons and implications', *New Zealand International Review*, 24:4, pp. 2.

⁶⁰ Wheeler, Nicholas J. and Dunne, Tim. 'East Timor and the New Humanitarian Interventionism', *International Affairs*, 77:4. pp. 812.

against greater autonomy within Indonesia he would request that the Indonesian government grant East Timor independence.⁶¹

Following Habibie's announcement an agreement was reached between Indonesia, the UN, and Portugal to conduct a UN supervised ballot to determine if the East Timorese wanted independence or greater autonomy within Indonesia. An outcome of this agreement was that the United Nations Assistance Mission in East Timor (UNAMET) was established. The role of UNAMET was to run the referendum on 30 August 1999, while Indonesia would remain responsible for maintaining peace and security throughout East Timor during the referendum process. This included ensuring the referendum was carried out in a fair and peaceful manner, and that there was an absence of violence or intimidation. The Indonesian authorities were also responsible to ensure the safety of the UN staff, international observers and local referendum staff.⁶²

In the period leading up to the ballot, pro-integration militias received funding and support from the Indonesian military, with their numbers swelling to around 25,000.⁶³ The pro-integration militias carried out a campaign of intimidation and violence against the pro-independence movement, civilians, local referendum staff, and the UN. However, the violence and campaign of intimidation that had been prevalent in the months leading up to the ballot was relatively absent on the day of the referendum. On 4 September 1999, the result of the referendum was announced, with 78.5 per cent of voters voting for

⁶¹ Wheeler. and Dunne. pp. 812.

⁶² Jago, Marianne. 'InterFET: An Account of Intervention with Consent in East Timor', *International Peacekeeping*, 17:3, pp. 378.

⁶³ Crawford. and Harper. pp. 28.

independence from Indonesia.⁶⁴ The result of the referendum came as a shock to Indonesian officials in Jakarta,⁶⁵ who had expected that the East Timorese would vote for greater autonomy within Indonesia.

The result of the referendum was a trigger for the pro-integration militia groups to escalate their campaign of violence. The militia groups went on a rampage, looting and burning homes and buildings, and targeting UN officials, journalists and international aid workers. Within a few days an estimated 1,000 people had been killed and around one quarter of the population had fled their homes.⁶⁶ Pro-integration militias also attempted to 'cleanse' pro-independence supporters from the western areas of East Timor. The Red Cross estimated that on 7 September around 3,000 people were being forcibly relocated across the border into West Timor every hour.⁶⁷ This was seen as an attempt to create a de-facto partition of East Timor that could be incorporated into Indonesia at a later date.

Amid the worsening violence the international community was vocal in its condemnation of Indonesia and on 5 September the UN Security Council demanded that Indonesia restore security to East Timor. In an attempt to placate the international outcry Indonesia declared martial law on 7 September, but this did little to halt the human rights abuses that were taking place. Despite the growing international pressure Indonesia continued to oppose any peacekeeping force and implied that it would resist any attempt to

⁶⁴ Maley, William. 'The UN and East Timor', *Pacifica Review: Peace, Security*, 12:1, pp 63.

⁶⁵ Jago. pp. 379.

⁶⁶ Wheeler, and Dunne, pp. 816.

⁶⁷ Murphy, Dan and McBeth, John. 'Scorched Earth', *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 16 September 1999, 162:37, pp. 13.

deploy a UN peacekeeping force.⁶⁸ As the violence continued the US and New Zealand suspended military co-operation with Indonesia, while leaders at the APEC summit in Auckland placed diplomatic pressure on Indonesia to halt the violence and consent to an UN peacekeeping force. There was also considerable pressure applied on Indonesia from the IMF and the World Bank.

In the aftermath of the Asian Financial Crisis Indonesia was heavily reliant on loans from the IMF and the World Bank to maintain stability and a functioning economy. As the violence continued the IMF described the events in East Timor as a 'humanitarian disaster'⁶⁹ and indicated to Indonesia that its failure to contain the violence would lead to funds being withheld. The IMF also cancelled a planned mission to Jakarta in September 1999. The World Bank indicated its disapproval of Indonesia and froze a \$1 billion aid programme to Indonesia.⁷⁰ This economic leverage was a key factor in Indonesia's decision to consent to a UN sanctioned force being deployed to East Timor.

By 12 September the diplomatic and financial pressure exerted on Indonesia led to President Habibie consenting to an UN sanctioned peacekeeping force to intervene and restore peace and stability to East Timor. Once Indonesia consented to the presence of an UN force in East Timor, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1264 on 15 September. Resolution 1264 determined that the situation in East Timor was a threat to international

⁶⁸ Jago. pp. 384.

⁶⁹ Ibid. pp. 387.

⁷⁰ Wheeler. and Dunne. pp. 820.

peace and security, authorised the deployment of a peacekeeping force to East Timor, and authorised the force to take all necessary measures to fulfil its mandate.⁷¹

New Zealand's decision to intervene in Indonesia is best explained by liberalism and New Zealand's desire to protect human rights and uphold democracy. To a lesser extent the decision was influenced by realist and constructivist elements, such as protecting New Zealand's international reputation and its relationship with Australia, and the emerging norm of humanitarian intervention and New Zealand's self conception as a good international citizen. However, for New Zealand, a UN mandate was essential before any decision would be made to intervene.

UN authorisation was of the utmost importance before the National government would consider participating in any intervention. It is unlikely that New Zealand would have contributed to any force that did not have a UN mandate, or at the minimum a mandate from a regional body with Indonesia's consent. During the parliamentary debate on East Timor on 7 September 1999, Foreign Minister Don McKinnon stated that "no country envisages sending forces to East Timor without the consent of the Indonesian Government. That would be tantamount to an invasion, and for New Zealand or any other country in the region such a proposition is just not a starter."⁷² After Indonesia accepted a UN peacekeeping force in East Timor Prime Minister Jenny Shipley stated "It appears that Indonesia's decision takes us toward meeting the conditions New Zealand has required all

⁷¹ United Nations Security Council Resolution 1264, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/1999/sc99.htm>.

⁷² McKinnon, Don. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Tuesday 7 September 1999. <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=07&o=2&p=8>.

along. We have an Indonesian invitation and broad-based support from the international community. Now we await a UN mandate.”⁷³

Realism does not adequately explain New Zealand’s decision to intervene in East Timor. If New Zealand felt that its security or national interests were at risk from the ongoing violence in East Timor, then it may have intervened to protect its national interests. However, neither New Zealand’s security nor its national interests were threatened by the ongoing violence in East Timor. While regional security was a concern it is unlikely that it was the driving factor behind the decision to intervene. In the press statement announcing that New Zealand would deploy troops to East Timor there was no mention of regional security,⁷⁴ and issues of regional security were largely absent from the Parliamentary debate on 17 September that debated the commitment of New Zealand Defence Force personnel to East Timor.⁷⁵

From a realist perspective Indonesia’s occupation of East Timor, and the subsequent violence, was not a major regional security concern. The situation in East Timor did not change the strategic balance of power in the region, and the contagion risk of the conflict spreading to other states was minimal. While there was a risk that East Timor could become a haven for trans-national crime, such as drugs and arms smuggling, this was unlikely given Indonesia’s military and police presence in East Timor. Of greater concern to regional

⁷³ Shipley, Jenny. *New Zealand Welcomes Decision to Admit Peacekeepers*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/new-zealand-welcomes-decision-admit-peacekeepers>, 13 September 1999.

⁷⁴ Bradford, Max. *NZ Peacekeepers to go to East Timor*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-peacekeepers-go-east-timor>, 16 September 1999.

⁷⁵ New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

security was that independence for East Timor might lead to the 'Balkanisation' of Indonesia. Areas such as Irian-Jaya and Aceh were already fighting for independence from Jakarta and it was feared that other areas of Indonesia might also push for independence.⁷⁶ The creation of a number of new states would have destabilised the region and increased the security threat to the region. For this reason it could be argued that maintaining Indonesia's territorial integrity, not supporting an intervention on behalf of the East Timorese, would have been the probable realist course of action.

Realism also does not explain why New Zealand risked significant trade links, and potential damage to its relationship with Indonesia over a small island with which it had little to no economic or state interests. East Timor was too poor and underdeveloped for New Zealand to have any trade concerns, or potential economic interests to develop. Even if New Zealand did have some economic interests in East Timor, they would have been insignificant in comparison to the Indonesian market of over 200 million people. East Timor also required millions of dollars in aid and ongoing assistance from the international community to help build the functions of state that had been neglected during the period of Indonesian rule.

However, from a realist perspective New Zealand's decision to intervene in East Timor was partially motivated by the desire to be seen as a credible and reliable ally to Australia,⁷⁷ and a regional partner that would contribute to regional security when required. The relationship with Australia is New Zealand's most important security and trade relationship. After the dissolution of the ANZUS Treaty the security aspects of this

⁷⁶ Cottrill, Ross. 'East Timor in Context', *New Zealand International Review*, 24:4, pp. 8.

⁷⁷ Crawford. and Harper. pp. 51-52.

relationship became more important for New Zealand. Australia argued that New Zealand should contribute to any force that would be deployed to East Timor and kept New Zealand informed about the advanced planning it had developed in the event a deployment had to be made. In the paper submitted to Cabinet on 16 September 1999, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the Minister of Defence argued that “To be internationally and domestically credible, a NZDF contribution needs to be of a significant size.....It would also be an appropriate contribution in the context of Closer Defence Relations with its emphasis on each country taking a fair share of the security burden.”⁷⁸ Declining to participate in the intervention in East Timor, or sending a token force, would have placed considerable strain on the relationship with Australia. While this demonstrates that realist factors were at play it is unlikely that they were the main motivating factor behind the decision to deploy troops to East Timor.

The decision to intervene in East Timor was primarily motivated by the liberal ideals of protecting human rights and upholding the democratic rights of the East Timorese. For a number of years New Zealand had been concerned about the ongoing violence in East Timor. This concern was heightened after a five member cross party delegation returned from East Timor and reported their findings to Parliament in September 1999.⁷⁹ After the referendum in East Timor it was apparent that, despite being capable, Indonesia was not abiding by its responsibility to maintain peace and stability in East Timor as agreed with the UN. It was also evident that the Indonesian armed forces were unwilling to stop the human rights abuses, and were aiding the militia groups in their activities.

⁷⁸ Crawford. and Harper. pp. 51-52.

⁷⁹ Hoadley, Stephen. ‘Diplomacy, Peacekeeping, and Nation-Building: New Zealand and East Timor’, *Southeast Asia and New Zealand: A History of Regional and Bilateral Relations*, ed Smith, Anthony. Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2005, pp. 132.

Prime Minister Jenny Shipley made it clear that New Zealand was appalled by the human rights violations that were taking place, and stated that making a commitment to support the human rights and aspirations of the people of East Timor was 'absolutely the right thing to do'.⁸⁰ Minister of Defence Max Bradford also affirmed New Zealand's commitment to human rights and stated that "[Indonesia] cannot be a peaceful player in the region with internal insecurity that spills over to us in a variety of ways, whether that be in terms of refugees, of internal civil strife, or, most important for this house, of a lack of respect for the human rights that we believe to be right and that the world believes to be right."⁸¹ Throughout the Parliamentary debate on the deployment of forces to East Timor the most common theme was that New Zealand should intervene to protect the human rights of the East Timorese.⁸²

The protection of human rights also extended to upholding the democratic rights of the East Timorese after they voted for independence from Indonesia. The New Zealand government believed that the democratic rights of the East Timorese should not be impeded by Indonesian intimidation and violence. Jenny Shipley stated that "the rapid deployment of a capable force of New Zealand men and women underlines New Zealand's firm willingness to ensure the expressed will of the East Timorese people is realised"⁸³ and "for freedom is a delicate and fragile thing, and New Zealand must do what it can to retain

⁸⁰ Crawford. and Harper. pp. 8.

⁸¹ Max Bradford, New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Friday 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>

⁸² New Zealand Parliamentary Debate 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>

⁸³ Shipley, Jenny. *NZ Peacekeepers to go to East Timor*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-peacekeepers-go-east-timor>, 16 September 1999.

the desire and the ability to defend freedom where that is necessary.”⁸⁴ As the referendum was held legitimately, it was felt that Indonesia should abide by its international obligations and grant the East Timorese their independence. For New Zealand, respect for human rights and democracy are rights that should be afforded to all people, and are ideals that are worth defending when possible.

The decision to intervene may have also been influenced by a desire to atone for New Zealand’s past negligence towards Indonesian human rights abuses in East Timor. In 2002 the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Phil Goff stated “New Zealand cannot alter what happened in 1975. It has at least provided some compensation for its silence then by the substantial assistance provided since 1999 in our peacekeeping efforts and in development assistance and diplomatic support.”⁸⁵ New Zealand never officially recognised Indonesia’s annexation of East Timor but it did describe East Timor’s incorporation into Indonesia as “irreversible”.⁸⁶ While New Zealand did not condone Indonesia’s actions in East Timor, it was not vocal in its opposition preferring to use ‘quiet diplomacy’ over ‘megaphone diplomacy’.⁸⁷ After the UN Security Council passed Resolution 389 in 1976, that called for Indonesia to ‘withdraw without further delay all its forces from the territory’,⁸⁸ New Zealand abstained from the General Assembly vote rather than risk its relationship with Indonesia. This was the first of many instances where New Zealand would vote against or abstain from

⁸⁴ Shipley, Jenny. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

⁸⁵ Goff, Phil. *Timor Papers Released*, www.beehive.govt.nz/release/timor-papers-released, 6 September 2002.

⁸⁶ Hoadley. pp 128.

⁸⁷ Ibid. pp. 129.

⁸⁸ United Nations Security Council Resolution 389, [www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/389\(1976\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/389(1976)).

votes regarding East Timor. To some this was seen as tacit support of Indonesia's policy towards East Timor.⁸⁹

Successive governments from both sides of the political spectrum had chosen to place realist concerns about trade and regional security above New Zealand's idealism and moral principles. A memorandum from the Secretary of Foreign Affairs to the Prime Minister dated 10 December 1975, just days after the invasion of East Timor, stated that "New Zealand has a strong interest in maintaining good relations with Indonesia even if this might on occasion require some measure of compromise on matters of principle."⁹⁰ While the advice given to the incoming Labour government in 1984 regarding East Timor was "The crux of the problem of East Timor is to reconcile New Zealand's opposition to the incorporation of East Timor by force, the subsequent human rights violations and repugnance at the sometimes brutal methods of the Indonesian army with the very considerable national interest in maintaining good relations with Indonesia, unquestionably the single most important country in South East Asia."⁹¹

From a constructivist perspective the decision to intervene was influenced by the emerging norm of humanitarian intervention, the international community's failure to intervene in Rwanda and Srebrenica, and the NATO led humanitarian intervention in Kosovo. The failure to intervene in Rwanda was especially poignant for New Zealand, which was a member of the UN Security Council during the Rwandan genocide. New Zealand was one of the only states to advocate for a greater UN involvement during the Rwandan crisis,

⁸⁹ Leadbeater, Maire. *Negligent Neighbour*, Craig Potton Publishing, Nelson, New Zealand, 2006.

⁹⁰ Goff, Phil. 'East Timor: Lessons and implications', *New Zealand International Review*, 24:4, pp. 2.

⁹¹ Ibid, pp. 3.

but was unable persuade other Security Council members to intervene.⁹² This experience galvanised New Zealand to prevent egregious human rights abuses or genocide where possible, and certainly within its own region. While the NATO intervention was an example of an emerging norm among some states to intervene on humanitarian grounds. Jenny Shipley referred to East Timor as our region's Kosovo.⁹³ By linking the Kosovo intervention to East Timor Shipley was using an example of a recent humanitarian intervention to gain support and acceptance for New Zealand's decision to intervene in East Timor. This also demonstrated that New Zealand would not just talk about the necessity of humanitarian intervention but would take action when it was required within its region. In this way New Zealand was contributing to the development of the norm of humanitarian intervention where a state will not protect its own citizens.

The emerging norm of humanitarian intervention may have been an influencing factor. However, it is more likely that it was an enabling factor rather than the reason for the intervention itself. The rise of the norm of humanitarian intervention created an international environment where interventions on humanitarian grounds were more permissible than during the 1970's and the Cold War. As humanitarian intervention was more acceptable New Zealand could contribute to alleviate the human rights abuses it had been concerned about since the 1970's. The dominant paradigm during the Cold War, realism, previously prevented any intervention on humanitarian grounds in East Timor.

⁹² Glanville, Luke. 'Norms, Interests and Humanitarian Intervention', *Global Change, Peace and Security: Formerly Pacifica Review: Peace, Security and Global Change*, 18:3, pp. 160.

⁹³ Jenny Shipley, New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Friday 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

Constructivism does help explain the role that New Zealand's national identity played in the decision to intervene in East Timor. The decision to intervene in East Timor could be seen as an extension of New Zealand's self conception as a state that is inclined to assist in the development of, and the protection of human rights. In announcing that New Zealand would send troops to East Timor Jenny Shipley stated that "The deployment of troops to East Timor will see New Zealanders once again taking up the baton to help those in need, and to safeguard the democratic process, human rights and freedom". Shipley made similar announcements prior to the decision to intervene being announced. On 13 September 1999, Shipley stated that "New Zealanders have shown repeatedly in the past that they are prepared to take a stand for what is right. This is a time for New Zealanders to show that same determination once again."⁹⁴, and on 15 September 1999 Shipley stated "New Zealanders have a proud tradition of standing up for what is right...It is time for New Zealanders to invoke that tradition again."⁹⁵ It was not only the Prime Minister that invoked New Zealand's tradition and identity. During the debate held on 17 September 1999, many speakers from both sides of the house referred to New Zealand's tradition and supported the deployment of troops to protect human rights again.⁹⁶

There was also considerable public support for a New Zealand contribution to a peacekeeping force in East Timor. Public support and awareness of the plight of the East Timorese people had been growing since the early 1990's, especially after the Dili massacre

⁹⁴ Shipley, Jenny. *New Zealand Welcomes Decision to Admit Peacekeepers*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/new-zealand-welcomes-decision-admit-peacekeepers>, 13 September 1999.

⁹⁵ Shipley, Jenny. *MPs to Debate East Timor Peacekeepers*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/mps-debate-east-timor-peacekeepers>, 15 September, 1999.

⁹⁶ New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Friday 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

in 1991 where 271 people were killed, 278 wounded and 270 'disappeared'.⁹⁷ The public support was reflected by the multi-party support for the deployment of troops to East Timor. In the special debate held on 17 September 1999, all parties, including the usually pacifist Alliance Party, supported the deployment of troops. A number of speakers, including the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, cited public support for the deployment of troops to assist with the UN mission. Prime Minister Jenny Shipley stated that "The overwhelming number of New Zealanders believe we should uphold international peace, security and democracy."⁹⁸ The wide spread public support for the intervention was reflected in two opinion polls conducted in late September 1999. One poll found that 60 per cent of people approved of the deployment to East Timor, while the other found that 80 per cent of people approved of the decision to support the UN peacekeeping mission.⁹⁹

Solomon Islands

The Solomon Islands is an archipelago of over 1,000 islands situated north east of Australia. It has a population of half a million people inhabiting six main islands and is ethnically diverse, with around 80 languages spoken.¹⁰⁰ While the most populous island is Malaita, the capital city, Honiara, is located on the island of Guadalcanal. The Solomon Islands is one of the poorest states in the world with few natural resources or economic opportunities for its citizens. In 1978, the Solomon Islands was granted independence from Britain but had few properly formed functions of state and was ill prepared to govern alone.

⁹⁷ Leadbeater. pp. 128.

⁹⁸ Shipley, Jenny. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

⁹⁹ Hoadley, pp. 133.

¹⁰⁰ Allen, Matthew, and Dinnen, Sinclair. 'The North Down Under: Antinomies of Conflict and Intervention in Solomon Islands', *Conflict, Security and Development*, 10:3, pp. 302.

For example, at the time of independence there were only 17 university graduates in the Solomon Islands.¹⁰¹ The neglect by the British colonial administration and its failure to develop a 'national identity' to unify the ethnically diverse population would contribute to the ethnic tensions and conflict that would blight the Solomon Islands in the late 1990's and early 2000's.

In 1998 tensions between the two largest ethnic groups, the Guadalcanalese and the Malaitans, began to increase on the island of Guadalcanal. The Guadalcanalese resented the migration of Malaitans to Guadalcanal since the end of the Second World War. A large number of Guadalcanalese believed that the Malaitans had become too dominant in Guadalcanal, taking over traditional Guadalcanal lands and controlling the local economy and government. As tensions grew the Guadalcanalese formed militia groups and began to clash with the settler Malaitans. The largest militia group, the Guadalcanal Revolutionary Army (GRA) later known as the Isatabu Freedom Movement (IFM), embarked on a campaign of violence and ethnically cleansed an estimated 35,000 Malaitans from the rural areas surrounding Honiara.¹⁰² In response, the Malaitans formed a rival militia group, the Malaita Eagle Force (MEF), to help protect the Malaitans on Guadalcanal.

The MEF had close ties with the Royal Solomon Islands Police Force, and when Prime Minister Ulufa'ulu declined to pay compensation to the Malaitans displaced by the IFM, the MEF raided the police armoury and staged a coup on 5 June 2000 overthrowing the government of Ulufa'ulu. As the fighting escalated between the MEF and the IFM the new Prime Minister, Manasseh Sogavare tried to make peace by offering compensation

¹⁰¹ Goff, Phil. 'Preventing State Failure', *New Zealand International Review*, 38:2, pp. 3.

¹⁰² Allen. and Dinnen. pp. 305.

payments to the belligerents.¹⁰³ On 2 August 2000, a ceasefire brought an end to the hostilities, during which Australia and New Zealand brokered the Townsville Peace Agreement (TPA) that was signed on 15 October 2000. The TPA aimed to disarm the militias and offered an amnesty to those involved in the fighting. The TPA also established the International Peace Monitoring Team (IPMT) that was designed to assist with the disarmament process and help implement the other aims of the TPA.¹⁰⁴

Despite the signing of the TPA the Solomon Islands continued to spiral out of control. The government was bankrupt with the GDP falling from US\$71 million in 1998 to US\$57 million in 2000 and falling a further 24 per cent between 2000 and 2002.¹⁰⁵ Basic functions of state, such as education and health, could not be provided and public servants went unpaid. The ethnic militias evolved into criminal gangs that extorted money out of politicians, while corruption was rife.¹⁰⁶ The poor governance structures and corruption also meant that many international donors refused to provide aid to the Solomon Islands government for fear of the aid being used to fund criminal activity.¹⁰⁷ This placed further strain on the limited finances of the Solomon Islands government.

When the TPA expired in October 2002 many of its goals such as the disarmament of the militias had only been partially successful.¹⁰⁸ The Guadalcanal Liberation Front (GLF),

¹⁰³ McDougall, Derek. 'Intervention in Solomon Islands', *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, 93:374, pp. 216.

¹⁰⁴ 'Townsville Peace Agreement', http://www.commerce.gov.sb/Gov/Peace_Agreement.htm.

¹⁰⁵ Ponzio, Richard. 'The Solomon Islands: The UN and Intervention by Coalitions of the Willing', *International Peacekeeping*, 12:2, pp. 174.

¹⁰⁶ Wainwright, Elsin. 'Responding to State Failure: The Case of Australia and Solomon Islands', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 57:3, pp. 488.

¹⁰⁷ McDougall, pp. 217.

¹⁰⁸ Halvorson, Dan. 'Reputation and Responsibility in Australia's 2003 Intervention in the Solomon Islands', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 67:4, pp. 448

which had refused to sign the TPA, continued to fight the IFM on the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal. The abundance of weapons and continued mistrust between the ethnic groups prevented the reconciliation between the Guadalcanalese and Malaitans that was envisaged in the TPA. Throughout 2002 and 2003 the violence, extortion and corruption continued unabated. As the economic and security situation in the Solomon Islands continued to deteriorate Prime Minister Sir Allen Kemakeza made a formal request to Australia for assistance on 22 April 2003.

This request was accepted by the Pacific Islands Forum and on 24 July 2003 the first contingent of the Regional Assistance Mission Solomon Islands (RAMSI) force landed in Honiara, including 105 New Zealand Defence Force personnel and 35 Police Officers.¹⁰⁹ The New Zealand contribution to RAMSI increased further in late August when an infantry company of 125 troops was deployed to the Solomon Islands.¹¹⁰ The key elements of the RAMSI mandate were to restore civil order, rebuild and reform the machinery of government, stabilise the government's finances, fight corruption, and help rebuild the economy.¹¹¹

Unlike the intervention in East Timor, New Zealand's decision to intervene in the Solomon Islands was primarily motivated by realist factors such as regional security concerns, and New Zealand's international reputation, rather than liberal factors. This does not mean that liberal ideals such as the protection of human rights were not a concern, but

¹⁰⁹ Goff, Phil. *NZ assistance to Solomon Islands government*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-assistance-solomon-islands-government>, 15 July 2003.

¹¹⁰ Clark, Helen. *Infantry company deployment to Solomons*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/infantry-company-deployment-solomons>, 25 August 2003.

¹¹¹ www.ramsi.org/about-ramsi/

that they were not the key factor in determining New Zealand's decision to intervene.

Throughout the 1 July 2003 Parliamentary debate on the deployment of troops to the Solomon Islands, the issue of human rights was barely mentioned.¹¹² A survey of the press releases leading up to the deployment of troops also shows a similar lack of attention given to human rights violations. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Phil Goff felt that the ethnic tensions in the Solomon Islands and the associated human rights abuses had largely been resolved by the TPA.¹¹³ If protection of human rights was the primary reason for the intervention, the question must be asked why it took New Zealand and Australia so long to intervene. Surely if the protection of human rights was the major issue an intervention would have taken place when an estimated 35,000 Malaitans were being ethnically cleansed from parts of Guadalcanal. However, neither Australia nor New Zealand were willing to intervene at that time. It is also worth noting that Prime Minister Kemakeza's request for assistance on 22 April 2003 was not the first time the Solomon Islands had appealed for assistance. The Solomon Islands' government had previously appealed to Australia for assistance prior to and after the coup in June 2000, but the requests were not deemed a priority at the time.¹¹⁴

The decision to intervene in the Solomon Islands was primarily driven by realist concerns about regional security, the threat of having a failing, or failed state in the Pacific region, and restoring law and order to the Solomon Islands. International concern regarding

¹¹² New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 1 July 2003, http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000724/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and and http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000808/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and.

¹¹³ Goff, Phil. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 1 July 2003, http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000724/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and

¹¹⁴ Halvorson. pp. 448.

the security implications of failed states had been growing since the mid 1990's.¹¹⁵ Failed states can also be used as bases for trans-national criminal activities such as drugs production and smuggling, arms and people trafficking, and money laundering. Failed states are also often used as safe havens for terrorist organisations. The weak governance of failed states often leads to porous borders where there is a lack of control over what enters and exits the state. This can have serious security implications for neighbouring states and the wider region. For example, it was thought that the bombs used in the 1998 embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania were smuggled across the borders from Somalia, a failed state.¹¹⁶

International concern over failed states was magnified after the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington D.C. It had become evident that failed states not only posed a serious security risk to their neighbours, but also to the wider international community. Afghanistan, a failed state, provided a safe haven from where Al Qaeda could plan and operate its terrorist activities. In 2002 President Bush stated that "the events of September 11, 2001, taught us that weak states, like Afghanistan, can pose as great a danger to our national interests as strong states."¹¹⁷ The threat of weak states and international terrorism to the Pacific region was reinforced after the 2002 Bali bombings where 202 people were killed, including three New Zealanders. The events of September 11, 2001 and the Bali Bombings, helped focus New Zealand's resolve to address the threat of failed states in the Pacific region.

¹¹⁵ Wainwright. pp. 486.

¹¹⁶ Wainwright. pp. 486.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

By 2003 the Solomon Islands was displaying many of the characteristics of a failing or failed state; a total breakdown of law and order, a government that had lost its monopoly over the use of violence, and a government that did not have control over all its territory. The Solomon Islands government was also unable to provide basic services such as health and education, or pay its civil servants.¹¹⁸ Ethnic tensions also continued to simmer as many Solomon Islanders transferred their loyalty from the government to ethnic groupings to ensure their protection and well being. The Australian Strategic Policy Institute reported in early 2003 that “The country has virtually ceased to function as a sovereign state, and on its present trajectory there is a high risk that its land and people will become effectively ungoverned.”¹¹⁹

As the Solomon Islands government did not have the capacity to control law and order, it was felt that an intervention led by Australia with assistance from New Zealand was necessary to prevent the Solomon Islands from becoming a failed state.¹²⁰ In the parliamentary debate about the decision to intervene in the Solomon Islands the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Phil Goff stated “We as a country cannot afford to allow a small neighbour to suffer from this condition, and to continue to deteriorate further to the point of being a failed state. We cannot afford that, because as we know from Afghanistan, a failed state very quickly becomes a haven for drug smugglers, arms traffickers, people smugglers and, potentially, terrorism.”¹²¹ The Minister of Defence, Mark Burton, stated that “The collapse of law and order has led to significant loss of life, destruction of homes, and the

¹¹⁸ Wainwright. pp. 487-488.

¹¹⁹ Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI), *Our Failing Neighbour*, Canberra, APSI, pp. 6.

¹²⁰ Goff, Phil. ‘Preventing State Failure’, *New Zealand International Review*, 38:2, pp. 3.

¹²¹ Goff, Phil. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Tuesday 1 July 2003. http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000724/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and

displacement of many families. The machinery of government is failing and the provision of even the most basic services is at risk.”¹²²

There was also a concern that the instability in the Solomon Islands could spread to other states in the Pacific. Mark Burton, stated that “The return of stability to the Solomon Islands is vital for the security of our region.”¹²³ The fear of contagion was heightened given the poor governance structures of many Pacific states and the recent history of the Pacific that included the Bougainville conflict in the late 1990’s, and the 2000 coup in Fiji. The threat of contagion was a real concern given the manner that the conflict in Bougainville spread to the Solomon Islands in 1998 with guns and refugees being transferred across the border.¹²⁴ The primary concern here was that continued instability in the Solomon Islands could have re-ignited the conflict in Bougainville that had been brought to an end after a successful intervention by Australia and New Zealand in 1998.

The decision to intervene was also motivated by a desire to maintain New Zealand’s international reputation and its relationship with Australia. There is an international expectation that New Zealand will play a significant role in ensuring the security and stability of the South Pacific. This role is not limited to providing diplomatic and economic support to the smaller Pacific states, but includes actively policing the region if the need arises. If New Zealand had not supported the intervention it would have placed considerable strain on the relationship with Australia and raised questions about New Zealand’s commitment to

¹²² Burton, Mark. *Minister farewells first deployment to Solomons*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/minister-farewells-first-deployment-solomons>, 23 July 2003.

¹²³ Burton, Mark. *NZDF involvement in Solomon Islands to be scaled back*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-involvement-solomon-islands-be-scaled-back>, 28 October 2003.

¹²⁴ Wainwright. pp 488.

upholding peace and security in the Pacific region. As with the intervention in East Timor, Australia expected New Zealand to contribute to any intervention to restore stability to the Solomon Islands. Australian Foreign Minister, Alexander Downer stated that Australia would “very much look to our friends in New Zealand” and “We hope and I’m confident there will be a significant New Zealand contribution.”¹²⁵ Later in 2003 the Australian High Commissioner to New Zealand, Alan Hawke, raised concerns about New Zealand’s relationship with Australia stating that the relationship was ‘finely poised’ and could go ‘one way or another’, he further stated that “New Zealand is already being criticised for not pulling its weight in this region, and now we discover that the Government will only provide troops if it likes the job they’re being asked to do and can look good doing it.”¹²⁶ By contributing to the intervention New Zealand could allay some of Australia’s concerns that it was not contributing enough to the region and that it was an ally that could be relied on. This was important after the divergence in policy between Australia and New Zealand over the Iraq invasion in 2003.

New Zealand’s concern about its international reputation was not solely based on its relationship with Australia. New Zealand was also concerned about its relationship with other Pacific Island states and the international community as a whole. In October 2000, the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) agreed to the Biketawa Declaration. The Biketawa declaration outlines the course of action PIF members should take when confronted with a crisis similar to that in the Solomon Islands. The declaration states: “Forum Leaders recognised the need in time of crisis or in response to members’ request for assistance, for action to be taken on the basis of all members of the Forum being part of the Pacific Islands extended family. The

¹²⁵ ‘New Zealand’s Part in Solomons Sketched Out’, *The Dominion Post*, 27 June 2003, pp. 1.

¹²⁶ Watkins, Tracy, ‘ANZAC tensions over Solomons’, *The Dominion Post*, 10 November 2003, pp. 5.

Forum must constructively address difficult and sensitive issues including underlying causes of tensions and conflict (ethnic tensions, socio-economic disparities, lack of good governance, land disputes and erosion of cultural values)."¹²⁷ If New Zealand was unwilling to assist a member of the PIF in the manner agreed upon under the Biketawa Declaration, other Pacific Island states may have begun to question New Zealand's commitment to the region's security. Would New Zealand provide support to them if they were in similar situation? Or would New Zealand leave them to suffer their own fate? Although the Biketawa Declaration is not a binding agreement, it could be seen as reneging on an international agreement if New Zealand did not assist the Solomon Islands after they requested help. If New Zealand did not assist Australia there could have been a negative impact on New Zealand's influence in the Pacific and on its international reputation, especially in regards to its commitments to the 'War on Terror' and its relationship with the United States.

Similar to the intervention in East Timor, it was important to the Labour government that any intervention had UN approval or regional consensus. The government was concerned about the perception among other Pacific Island states that New Zealand and Australia were intervening like 'big brother' in a small Pacific Island. It was thought that similarities may be drawn between the invasion of Iraq and any intervention in the Solomon Islands¹²⁸ and that it may appear to other smaller Pacific states that Australia and New Zealand were putting together a Pacific 'coalition of the willing'. This concern was

¹²⁷ *Biketawa Declaration*, www.forumsec.org/pages.cfm/political-governance-security/biketawa-declaration/.

¹²⁸ McCraw, David. 'New Zealand Foreign Policy Under the Clark Government: High Tide of Liberal Internationalism', *Pacific Affairs*, 78:2, pp. 229.

heightened given Australia's participation and support of the invasion of Iraq earlier in 2003.¹²⁹

Given the government's concerns, obtaining consent from the Solomon Islands government and support from the international community was an important factor in the decision to intervene. However, obtaining a UN Security Council mandate for any intervention was unlikely. The Solomon Islands' diplomatic relations with Taiwan, which was a major aid donor, would have drawn a likely veto from China to any potential intervention.¹³⁰ As a UN Security Council approval was unlikely it was felt that any intervening force should be sanctioned by the PIF and include contributions from as many Pacific states as possible. To this end, New Zealand and Australia appealed to the principles of the Biketawa Declaration to gain a consensus on the intervention from the PIF. After consultation, the PIF Foreign Ministers supported an intervention on 30 June 2003. On 17 July 2003 the Solomon Islands government unanimously approved the intervention. The intervention was given further legitimacy by the contributions from a wide range of Pacific states, not just Australia and New Zealand. The emphasis on building a multinational approach and gaining international legitimacy for the intervention is an example of New Zealand adhering to liberal ideals that security is best achieved via cooperation rather than a unilateral approach.

¹²⁹ Watkins, Tracy, 'Solomons Concern Minister', *The Press*, 9 July 2003, pp. 6.

¹³⁰ Ponzio. pp. 176.

Conclusions

The two case studies assessed in this chapter demonstrate that the motivations to intervene in East Timor differed from those in the Solomon Islands. The decision to intervene in East Timor is best explained by the liberal factors of protecting the human and democratic rights of the East Timorese. New Zealand had no national interests at stake in East Timor, and from a realist perspective may have preferred East Timor to remain part of Indonesia. On the other hand, the intervention in the Solomon Islands is best explained by the realist factors of regional security concerns and upholding New Zealand's relationship with Australia. The emerging norm of humanitarian intervention and assisting a state in trouble as envisaged in the 'Responsibility to Protect' was evident in both of the case studies. However, the emerging norm was likely to be more of an enabling factor rather than the primary motivating factor.

Chapter Four: New Zealand's Interventions Outside the Asia-Pacific Region

Bosnia

The conflicts that plagued the former Yugoslavia during the 1990's began after Croatia and Slovenia declared their independence on 25 June 1991.¹³¹ Initially the Yugoslav Army attempted to prevent Slovenia's break away from the union but after a short conflict a cease fire was brokered by the European Community on 2 July 1991. Unlike Slovenia, which gained independence with little bloodshed, Croatia fought a bitter conflict from July 1992 to 1995 to gain its independence from Yugoslavia. One of the features of the Croatian War was the use of paramilitary forces, both Serbian and Croatian, to intimidate and terrorise other ethnic groups. The aim of these intimidation campaigns was to ethnically cleanse areas to create homogenous ethnic regions that would strengthen their claim to the area. On 2 January 1992, a UN brokered cease-fire was agreed, while the European Community recognised Croatia as an independent state on 15 January 1992. To support the ceasefire the UN Security Council passed resolution 743 that established the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR).¹³² UNPROFOR's primary mandate was to help create the security conditions where a final settlement could be negotiated, ensure the security of the three UN Protected Areas, and to assist with the delivery of humanitarian aid.¹³³

Once the European Community recognised Croatia as an independent state in early 1992, it became apparent that if Bosnia did not move towards independence it would

¹³¹ Benson, Leslie. *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*, Palgrave, New York, 2001, pp. 161.

¹³² United Nations Security Council Resolution 743,
[http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/743\(1992\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/743(1992)).

¹³³ http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unprof_p.htm.

remain part of a Serb dominated Yugoslavia. However, before Bosnia would obtain independence its multi-ethnic population would endure three years of brutal fighting. At the outbreak of war the Bosnian population was estimated to be 49% Bosnian Muslim, 32% Bosnian Serb, and 17% Bosnian Croat.¹³⁴ The Bosnian population was intertwined with no ethnic group dominating any large areas of the country. As the fighting in Croatia subsided in January 1992, the Serb dominated Yugoslav Army withdrew its forces and heavy weaponry from Croatia and established positions around major towns and cities in Bosnia, including the capital Sarajevo. On 29 February and 1 March 1992, a referendum was held in Bosnia asking “Are you in favour of a sovereign and independent Bosnia-Herzegovina, a state of equal citizens and nations of Muslims, Serbs, and Croats and others who live in it?”¹³⁵ The referendum was boycotted by much of the Bosnian Serb population who had already declared their own autonomous zones. Despite the Bosnian Serb boycott, an estimated 64% of the population voted in the referendum with the result being nearly unanimous in favour of an independent Bosnia-Herzegovina.¹³⁶

Immediately after the results of the referendum were announced Serb paramilitary groups established roadblocks and sniper positions throughout Bosnia. The European Community attempted to resolve the situation in Bosnia by political means, however this was unsuccessful after a proposal to divide Bosnia into 10 ethnic ‘cantons’ was rejected by the Croat population.¹³⁷ The chances of the escalating violence being resolved by political means were further diminished after the Bosnian Serbs declared the Serb Republic on 27

¹³⁴ Chenoy, Anuradha M. ‘The European Union and the Breakup of Yugoslavia’, *International Studies*, 33:4, pp. 446.

¹³⁵ Malcom, Noel, *Bosnia: A Short History*, New York University Press, New York, pp. 231.

¹³⁶ Ibid.

¹³⁷ Ibid. pp. 233.

March 1992.¹³⁸ Following the Declaration of the Serb Republic, Serbian paramilitary groups, including Arkan's Tigers, began to ethnically cleanse the region of non-ethnic Serbs.¹³⁹ This included the establishment of detention camps and systematic destruction of buildings and other objects of cultural significance to the Muslim population.

In response to the referendum and the increasing violence, the European Community and the United States recognised Bosnia-Herzegovina as a sovereign state on 6 April 1992.¹⁴⁰ The UN recognised Bosnia-Herzegovina on 22 May 1992¹⁴¹ and imposed sanctions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The UN also extended the mandate of UNPROFOR to include operations in Bosnia. However, as there was no peace to keep in Bosnia the main objectives of UNPROFOR in Bosnia were to secure Sarajevo airport, assist in separating the belligerents, assist with the transfer of humanitarian aid, and to protect the UN safe zones established to provide a safe haven for Bosnian Muslim civilians. By separating the belligerents it was hoped a degree of confidence could be established that would enable the conditions where a peace settlement could be negotiated.

Despite the presence of UNPROFOR, the fighting intensified and by November 1992, an estimated 1.5 million people, or one third of the population, were refugees.¹⁴² Evidence also began to emerge that mass killings, mass rape, and ethnic cleansing were taking place throughout Bosnia. Detention camps were also being established by Bosnian Serbs to detain the Muslim population. In 1993 the UN Security Council authorised an increase of

¹³⁸ Benson. pp. 165.

¹³⁹ Ibid.

¹⁴⁰ Malcolm. pp. 234.

¹⁴¹ Benson. pp. 165.

¹⁴² Ibid. pp. 166.

10,000 extra peacekeepers for Bosnia. However, the troops never materialised and the UN could not protect civilians in the 'safe-havens'. This placed enormous pressure on the credibility of the UN and its ability to resolve the conflict. International resolve to address the conflict increased after reports of mass atrocities were verified, and the shelling of a market place in Sarajevo that killed 68 civilians and wounded another 197 on 5 February 1994.¹⁴³ On April 27, 1994, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 914 that authorised an additional 6,500 troops to be deployed to assist UNPROFOR in Bosnia.¹⁴⁴

On 23 May 1994, in response to the request from the UN for more troops, the New Zealand government announced that it would contribute a reinforced infantry company of 250 personnel to assist with the UNPROFOR operations in Bosnia. The deployment represented the largest operation undertaken by the New Zealand Defence Force since the Vietnam War. The infantry company would be deployed along side a British Battalion, but would remain under New Zealand command. It was determined that the size of the force was large enough to ensure it could respond to and fulfil the tasks requested of it, but also large enough to be mainly self-sufficient despite being stationed with a British Battalion. Although public opinion was evenly split on the issue,¹⁴⁵ the decision was supported by the majority of Parliament, with only two minor parties, New Zealand First and the Alliance, opposed to the decision.

The decision to intervene in Bosnia is best explained by liberalism. The decision was primarily motivated by New Zealand's support for the UN, while New Zealand's role on the

¹⁴³ Binder, David. 'Anatomy of a Massacre', *Foreign Policy*, Winter 1994-1995, 70, pp. 70.

¹⁴⁴ United Nations Security Council Resolution 914, Daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N94/195/62/PDF/N9419562.pdf?OpenElement.

¹⁴⁵ Munro, Mike. 'Poll shows even split on troops for Bosnia', *The Dominion*, 23 April 1994, pp. 2.

Security Council at the time as also a significant factor. While the liberal paradigm offers the best explanation for the intervention, the decision was also influenced by realist elements, in that the National government had a desire to develop New Zealand's reputation and international credibility.

Initially the Ministry of Foreign Affairs opposed any deployment to Bosnia arguing that Bosnia was not in New Zealand's sphere of interest, and that any deployment of troops should come primarily from European states.¹⁴⁶ The Ministry of Foreign Affairs argued that New Zealand's area of interest was the Pacific, and that this is where New Zealand should focus its defence policy and any peacekeeping missions. The Minister of Foreign Affairs Don McKinnon added that the days of New Zealand automatically contributing to a European war were over.¹⁴⁷ Don McKinnon also felt that New Zealand had demonstrated its commitment to the UN and its peacekeeping operations by contributing to peacekeeping forces in Somalia and Cambodia, both of which he argued were in New Zealand's wider sphere of influence.

Unlike the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which initially opposed any deployment to Bosnia, the Ministry of Defence took a broader view of what constituted New Zealand's national interests and supported a New Zealand troop contribution to UNPROFOR. The Ministry of Defence viewed New Zealand's interests as including upholding the credibility of, and supporting the UN. The Secretary of Defence, Gerald Hensley, argued that continued support for the UN was a cornerstone of New Zealand's foreign policy and stated that New Zealand's national interests "are not just regional, they include support of the United

¹⁴⁶ 'Troop decision against advice, Bolger reveals', *The Dominion*, 25 May 1994, pp. 1.

¹⁴⁷ 'Dad's Army dither over Bosnia troops', *New Zealand Herald*, 7 May 1994, pp. 8.

Nations. Our national interest...must be balanced with our interests in the continued credibility of the UN.”¹⁴⁸ Mr Hensley believed that the credibility of the UN was at stake, less in terms of the eventual outcome of the situation in Bosnia, but in the UN’s ability to garner the will of the international community to deal with the issue. Mr Hensley argued that the UN would not be judged harshly if it could not resolve the conflict in Bosnia, only if it failed to act. Mr Hensley also stated that the “criticism will rest on the shoulders of those nations whose unwillingness to take part was the root cause of the United Nations failure. The harshest criticism will belong to those whose deeds did not measure up to the words.”¹⁴⁹

The Prime Minister, Jim Bolger, agreed with the Ministry of Defence’s position, that supporting the credibility of the UN was an important aspect of New Zealand’s foreign policy. Jim Bolger argued that New Zealand could not pick and choose when it participated in UN operations based on geography stating that “The UN mandate is worldwide; human suffering is the same worldwide, it is not segmented in zones near and far. There is and can be no moral justification for saying that if it is close to New Zealand we are interested, if it is a long way away count us out. We cannot and should not ignore suffering on the grounds of distance.”¹⁵⁰ Bolger also stated “The Government considers it important that New Zealand, as a small member state strongly committed to the founding principles of the United Nations, plays its part to the greatest extent possible in supporting and implementing the decisions of the United Nations Security Council.”¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁸ ‘Departments argued over Bosnia policy’, *New Zealand Herald*, 29 July 1994, pp. 5.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Bolger, Jim. Parliamentary debate, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.

¹⁵¹ Bolger, Jim. Ministerial Statement, Parliamentary records, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=9&p=11>,

Jim Bolger rejected the notion held by some analysts that New Zealand should not deploy troops as there was no peace to keep.¹⁵² Bolger believed that the UN had a responsibility to try to end the fighting stating “We agreed, as a government, to increase the New Zealand contribution because we believe in the United Nations, and in the United Nations Protection Force in Bosnia, as one of the few means available to the world to assist the people and to help to bring about a negotiated peace”.¹⁵³ The government believed that small states participating in the UN process can bring about positive change and help find a peaceful solution to the situation in Bosnia. To achieve this New Zealand had to be an active member of the UN, not just debate the issues and take no actual action when needed. After initially being reticent, believing that Bosnia was outside New Zealand’s area of interest, Don McKinnon argued that while Bosnia was not in New Zealand’s normal sphere of interest, the Balkans was at the crossroads of the world and that the risk to world if the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia went unabated was significant.¹⁵⁴ Don McKinnon also indicated that supporting the UN’s credibility was an important national interest stating that “the world could just shake its head and wipe its hands and walk away. That would be an awful situation to occur because it would not give anyone any confidence in the UN. We have to work very hard right now to ensure the UN and, more particularly, the Security Council’s credibility is maintained.”¹⁵⁵

New Zealand’s membership of the UN Security Council during 1993-94 was a significant factor in the decision to deploy troops to Bosnia. After New Zealand won a seat

¹⁵² Thakur, Ramesh, ‘Why New Zealand should say no to Bosnia’, *New Zealand Herald*, 26 May 1994, pp. 9.

¹⁵³ Bolger, Jim. Parliamentary debate, 24 May 1994.

<http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.

¹⁵⁴ McKinnon, Don. New Zealand Parliamentary debate, 24 May 1994,

<http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.

¹⁵⁵ McKinnon Wary of Bosnia Troop Request’, *Sunday Star Times*, 24 April 1994, p. 2.

on the UN Security Council Don McKinnon indicated that New Zealand would take an active role in UN peacekeeping operations stating that “We intend to participate, rather than cheering or criticising others in the international community from the sidelines.”¹⁵⁶ Prior to the announcement of the decision to deploy troops Don McKinnon, stated that New Zealand’s membership of the UN Security Council was an influencing factor, but that it did not compel New Zealand to contribute, nor was it the dominant factor.¹⁵⁷ However, during the Parliamentary debate on the decision both Jim Bolger and Don McKinnon linked the government’s decision to New Zealand’s membership of the Security Council. Don McKinnon stated “Obviously it would be inappropriate for New Zealand to sit on the Security Council and make decisions as constantly as it has done on a number of issues, yet all the time say “No, we are not prepared to be involved.”¹⁵⁸ Jim Bolger stated “In reaching this decision, the government has been particularly mindful of the special responsibility New Zealand bears at this time as a member of the United Nations Security Council, as well as the responsibility New Zealand has as a founding member of the United Nations.”¹⁵⁹ The statements and position the National government took indicates that the decision to intervene in Bosnia was primarily rooted in liberal thought and the belief in the primacy of the UN to resolve international conflicts. However, there was also realist thinking concerning New Zealand’s reputation that was a contributing factor in the decision to intervene.

¹⁵⁶ McCraw, David. ‘New Zealand’s Foreign Policy in the 1990’s: In the National Tradition’, *The Pacific Review*, 13:4. pp. 584.

¹⁵⁷ ‘UN Role Not Dominant In NZ-Bosnia Decision’, *New Zealand Herald*, 14 May 1994, pp. 5.

¹⁵⁸ McKinnon, Don. New Zealand Parliamentary debate, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.

¹⁵⁹ Bolger, Jim. Ministerial Statement, Parliamentary records, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=9&p=11>.

From a realist perspective the intervention was motivated by the National government's belief that it had to develop New Zealand's international reputation and improve its relationship with its traditional allies. When the National Party was voted into government in 1990 the new Minister of Foreign Affairs Don McKinnon, was concerned that New Zealand's image on the world stage had suffered in the wake of the nuclear free debate and the breakup of the ANZUS alliance. McKinnon stated that "Our international image had become a confused and ambiguous one. We were seen as idealistic, some would have said naive and even arrogant. We were inclined to extreme positions and probably a bit hard to read."¹⁶⁰ Some states viewed New Zealand as isolationist in its approach to global politics and security. New Zealand's main traditional allies, the US, the UK, and Australia also questioned New Zealand's reliability and whether New Zealand would be prepared to respond positively to international crises. As such, one of the defence goals of the new National government was to re-establish effective defence relationships with New Zealand's traditional partners, especially the US the UK.¹⁶¹ Committing troops to Bosnia could be seen as a means of affirming New Zealand's relationship with its allies, especially after it received a direct appeal from John Major, the Prime Minister of the UK, requesting that New Zealand contribute to the UNPROFOR force. Don McKinnon also argued that New Zealand had to make a contribution to the peacekeeping force in Bosnia if it was to be taken seriously in the UN after its membership of the UN Security Council finished.¹⁶²

¹⁶⁰ McKinnon, Don. *New Zealand Foreign Policy- A Decade of Change*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/new-zealand-foreign-policy-decade-change>, 13 July 1999.

¹⁶¹ McCraw, David. 'New Zealand's Defence Policy: From Realism to Idealism?', *Defence and Security Analysis*, 24:1, pp. 25.

¹⁶² 'Troops for Bosnia supported', *New Zealand Herald*, 7 May 1994, pp. 5.

New Zealand's international reputation had also come under scrutiny by its stance not to remove the arms embargo placed on Bosnia. Many smaller states believed that due to New Zealand's anti-nuclear policy New Zealand would not automatically align with the permanent Western powers on the Security Council, and would be an effective voice for smaller and non-aligned states. However, many of the states who had voted for New Zealand were becoming disillusioned with New Zealand's position regarding the arms embargo.¹⁶³ The arms embargo that came into effect in 1992 was an attempt to contain the conflict and mitigate the risk of a larger conflagration. However, one of the side effects of the arms embargo was that the Bosnians were largely unable to defend themselves against the better equipped and supplied Serbs. The UN General Assembly twice voted to lift the arms embargo, but on both occasions the Security Council refused to lift the embargo. New Zealand preferred to abstain from the vote rather than risk damaging its relations with France and the UK.¹⁶⁴ Some states perceived that by abstaining from the vote New Zealand defied the will of the General Assembly to protect its own interest.

In particular Malaysia, a predominantly Muslim state, who voted for New Zealand's seat on the UN Security Council and was New Zealand's largest export market in South-East Asia,¹⁶⁵ was unimpressed with New Zealand's position towards Bosnia. Malaysia placed a significant amount of diplomatic pressure on New Zealand to contribute to UNPROFOR, and to have the arms embargo lifted. The Malaysian Prime Minister, Dr Mahathir, told Mr Bolger that membership of the Security Council "bears with it a grave responsibility" and that "Members of the Council must face up to the challenges arising from the numerous tragic

¹⁶³ Cooper, Andrew, 'Bosnia vote damages NZ reputation', *The Dominion*, 20 January 1994, pp. 7.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Orsman, Bernard. 'Malaysia to Press PM', *New Zealand Herald*, 19 May 1994, pp. 1.

conflicts currently raging around the world”.¹⁶⁶ Although it is unlikely that pressure from Malaysia was the decisive factor, pressure from the international community and New Zealand’s desire to be seen as a positive player in the UN contributed to the decision to deploy troops to Bosnia.

While building better relations with New Zealand’s allies and developing New Zealand’s international reputation may have been an outcome of New Zealand’s decision to deploy troops to Bosnia, it is unlikely that these reasons alone were enough to persuade the government to contribute New Zealand forces to UNPROFOR. In the parliamentary debate on the decision to deploy troops Jim Bolger stated “There may be some foreign benefits from this policy but that is not the issue. That was not a major consideration of the Government. The consideration on this occasion was when and how New Zealand should respond to the UN request and the answer was we can respond, we can do it now, and we can do it in a sensible fashion.”¹⁶⁷ This further indicates that the main motivating factor was New Zealand’s belief in upholding the credibility of the UN as the best means to resolve international disputes.

Afghanistan and the War on Terror

After the September 11 2001 terrorist attacks in New York and Washington D.C., New Zealand contributed political and military support to the ‘War on Terror’. The Special Air Service (SAS) was deployed to Afghanistan in 2001, 2004 and 2008, New Zealand

¹⁶⁶ Orsman, Bernard. ‘Bolger Hesitates on Bosnia’, *New Zealand Herald*, 21 May 1994, pp. 2.

¹⁶⁷ Bolger, Jim. New Zealand Parliamentary debate, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.

contributed to the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, and led a Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) in Bamyan Province from 2003 to 2013. New Zealand also deployed the Navy Frigate, Te Mana, on interdiction operations in the Arabian Sea and Gulf of Oman as part of 'Operation Enduring Freedom'. Although New Zealand did not support or participate in the invasion of Iraq in 2003, it did deploy army engineers to support the reconstruction and stabilisation efforts in Iraq in the aftermath of the Iraq war.

Like the decision to intervene in Bosnia, the decisions to intervene in Afghanistan, support the 'War on Terror', and deploy army engineers to Iraq was based primarily on liberal thinking. The main motivating factor for the intervention in Afghanistan was the Labour government's belief in upholding international law to stop the Taliban from providing Al Qaeda a safe haven from where it could operate with impunity.¹⁶⁸ The government was also appalled by the September 11 terrorist attacks which Helen Clark described as being an "attack on humanity as a whole."¹⁶⁹ The decision to deploy army engineers to Iraq after the conflict in 2003 further demonstrated the government's belief in upholding international law and supporting the UN.

As a small trade dependent state that lacks the hard power required to assert its interests via coercive military or economic means, New Zealand places great significance on the integrity of international law and support for the UN. From a New Zealand perspective an international system based on the primacy of international law is essential to ensure the

¹⁶⁸ Goff, Phil. *NZ's role in peacekeeping and in Afghanistan*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/24340>, 10 November 2005.

¹⁶⁹ Clark, Helen. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 18 September 2001, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=2001&m=09&d=18&o=12&p=12>.

flow of trade, technology, and investment that enables New Zealand to maintain its standard of living and well being.¹⁷⁰ As New Zealand benefits from an international system based on the rule of law, its foreign policy is closely aligned with adhering to, and upholding international law. New Zealand also believes that international law and the UN are the best mechanisms to achieve peace and stability in the international system. The events of September 11 2001, demonstrated the far reaching consequences that can occur when a state operates outside of international law.

Since coming to power in 1996 the Taliban regime had repeatedly disregarded international law by ignoring the UN resolutions that called for it to not provide a safe haven for terrorist organisations. After the 1998 bombings of the US embassies in Nairobi and Dar-es-Salaam, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 1189 that stressed “every state has the duty to refrain from organising, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorism in another state or acquiescing in organised activities within its territory.”¹⁷¹ Later in 1998, after it was apparent that Al Qaeda was responsible for the bombings, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1214 that was more explicit in its condemnation of the Taliban. Resolution 1214 demanded that the “Taliban stop providing sanctuary and training for international terrorists and their organisations.”¹⁷² After the US indicted Osama Bin Laden for responsibility for the East African Embassy bombings, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1267 that demanded that the Taliban turn Osama Bin Laden over to

¹⁷⁰ O'Brien, Terence, 'New Zealand foreign policy: the importance of reputation', *New Zealand International Review*, 38:5, pp. 20.

¹⁷¹ United Nations Security Council Resolution 1189, [www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1189\(1998\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1189(1998)).

¹⁷² United Nations Security Council Resolution 1214, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/1998/scres98.htm>.

authorities from a country where he has been indicted.¹⁷³ Despite the numerous requests, the Taliban continued to ignore international law and provided Al Qaeda with a safe haven from where it could plan and train for its terrorist activities that culminated in the attacks on September 11. After the September 11 attacks the Taliban continued to resolutely ignore international calls for it not to provide a safe haven to Al Qaeda and to turn Bin Laden over to the US for trial.

As the Taliban refused to abide by international law it was recognised that the use of military force is, at times, the only viable option available to prevent gross violations of international law. Despite multiple UN resolutions and sanctions that called for the Taliban not to provide terrorist groups with a safe haven, the Taliban's behaviour did not alter. As the diplomatic options had been exhausted, or ignored by the Taliban, the Labour government felt that the only means of ensuring international law was upheld in this situation was through military force. Foreign Minister Phil Goff argued that "there are clearly times when we are compelled to resort to military action to protect ourselves, to prevent appalling human rights abuses and preserve values fundamental to what we are and what we stand for.....Al Qaeda and the Taliban regime which hosts it cannot be defeated by UN resolutions."¹⁷⁴ As the government was appalled by the terrorist attacks and believed that international terrorism was the most serious threat to international peace and security,¹⁷⁵ it was felt that military action was required to ensure international law was enforced and to help prevent any future attacks originating from Afghanistan.

¹⁷³ United Nations Security Council Resolution 1267, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/1999/sc99.htm>.

¹⁷⁴ Goff, Phil. *The UN and Civil Society*, www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/un-and-civil-society, 23 November 2001.

¹⁷⁵ Goff, Phil. *Goff Meets Armitage in Washington*, www.beehive.govt.nz/release/goff-meets-armitage-washington, 26 September 2001.

The Labour government's support for the UN and of a multilateral approach to address the security threat posed by the Taliban is another example of the liberal approach taken in the decision to intervene in Afghanistan. After September 11, the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1368 that called on all states to work together to bring to justice the perpetrators, organisers, and the sponsors of the terrorist attacks, stressed that those responsible for supporting and harbouring the perpetrators would be held accountable, and expressed its readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the attacks.¹⁷⁶ Prime Minister Helen Clark emphasised the need for a multilateral approach to combat terrorism during the parliamentary debate where parliament supported the deployment of the SAS to Afghanistan. Clark stated "what we know is that no single government can, by itself, eradicate terrorism. Terrorism's ramifications are truly global, and getting on top of them requires a very broad response."¹⁷⁷ As the UN had called for members to act, and New Zealand had a strong belief in supporting the UN, the Labour government felt obligated to assist the UN in the best manner it could.

New Zealand's commitment to upholding international law and support for the UN was further demonstrated by the decision not to join or support the 'Coalition of the Willing' in the military intervention in Iraq in 2003, but to deploy army engineers after the conflict had ended. Helen Clark argued that any military action against Iraq that was not authorised by the UN would weaken international law.¹⁷⁸ It was also argued that any attack

¹⁷⁶ United Nations Security Council Resolution 1368, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/2001/sc2001.htm>.

¹⁷⁷ Clark, Helen. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 3 October 2001, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=2001&m=10&d=03&o=16&p=31>.

¹⁷⁸ Patman, Robert G, *'Globalisation, Sovereignty and the transformation of New Zealand Foreign Policy'*, Centre for Strategic Studies New Zealand, Working Paper, Victoria University of Wellington, 2005. pp. 14.

on Iraq could strengthen terrorist groups, such as Al-Qaeda, by providing them with propaganda material and justification for their acts of terrorism. New Zealand's preferred solution to the Iraq crisis was to work through the UN, and to allow the weapons inspectors enough time to ascertain whether or not Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD), or had facilities capable of developing WMDs. If the weapons inspectors determined that Iraq had contravened the UN resolutions prohibiting Iraq from possessing WMDs and subsequently the UN Security Council approved military action against Iraq, New Zealand would have contributed medical or logistical support to the authorized intervention.¹⁷⁹ As there was no UN Security Council mandate for the military action the Labour government believed that any military intervention would be illegal and therefore did not support or participate in the initial conflict.

However, after Saddam Hussein had been defeated and the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1483 that appealed to UN member states to contribute towards the rebuild of Iraq, New Zealand announced that it would deploy 60 army engineers to Iraq and a navy frigate to the Straits of Hormuz.¹⁸⁰ The importance of working through the UN for any military presence in Iraq was paramount for the Labour government. Before making any decision on the deployment of military personnel to Iraq, the government expected that the UN would have a significant role in the reconstruction of Iraq. Phil Goff stated that "a resolution, accompanied no doubt by a call for the international community as a whole to assist in the rebuilding process, would clear the way for New Zealand and a wide range of other countries to make further contributions across areas such as humanitarian assistance

¹⁷⁹ McCraw, David. New Zealand Foreign Policy Under the Clark Government: High tide of Liberal Internationalism, *Pacific Affairs*, 78:2, pp. 225.

¹⁸⁰ Clark, Helen. 'NZDF Deployment to Iraq' <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-deployment-iraq>, 11 August 2003.

and reconstruction.”¹⁸¹ Helen Clark stated that the “government has consistently said that New Zealand was prepared to provide humanitarian and reconstruction assistance at the end of the conflict, provided that there was appropriate multilateral cover”¹⁸² The UN resolution also gave the government assurance that it would not be viewed as an occupying power.¹⁸³

For the Labour government, only the UN had the authority to sanction military action. The Labour government also believed that multinational cooperation was the best means to achieve peace and stability in the international system. Phil Goff stated that New Zealand’s stance over Iraq was based on “a principled position founded in the conviction that world order is best secured through peaceful, multilateral action.”¹⁸⁴ However, if the UN Security Council sanctioned military action and requested assistance, then as a member of the UN New Zealand would be obligated to support the decision. Helen Clark emphasised this when she stated that “If we are going to pick and choose the Security Council resolutions we uphold, then we contribute to undermining the organisation.”¹⁸⁵ As the UN Security Council passed a resolution calling for assistance to rebuild Iraq, the Labour government felt it had to consider the appropriate support New Zealand could offer.

Concerns about the stability of both Afghanistan and Iraq were also factors in the decision to take responsibility for a PRT in Afghanistan and to deploy army engineers to Iraq.

¹⁸¹ Goff, Phil. *NZ hopes resolution will clear way for UN role in Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-hopes-resolution-will-clear-way-un-role-iraq>, 9 May 2003.

¹⁸² Clark, Helen. *NZDF Deployment to Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-deployment-iraq>, 11 August 2003.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Goff, Phil. *New Zealand’s role in the rebuilding of Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/new-zealand039s-role-rebuilding-iraq>, 12 May 2003.

¹⁸⁵ McCraw, David. ‘New Zealand Foreign Policy Under the Clark Government: High tide of Liberal Internationalism’, *Pacific Affairs*, 78:2, pp. 225.

The PRTs were civil-military units tasked to aid the central government in Kabul extend its authority throughout Afghanistan. The PRTs assisted in creating a stable security environment that was conducive to rebuilding the infrastructure of Afghanistan that had been destroyed by twenty years of war. From 2003 until 2013, New Zealand took responsibility for the PRT in Bamyan Province. It was believed that by assisting in the development of democratic rights and a free market both Afghanistan and Iraq could be more secure. This underlines the liberal thinking behind the decision to deploy troops to Afghanistan and Iraq.

The decision to take responsibility for the PRT in Bamyan was largely based on the recognition that helping to rebuild Afghanistan was an essential element in the fight against terrorism. Helen Clark stated that “it is in the international community’s interest to assist the Afghan government.”¹⁸⁶ Clark also noted that “without stability, efforts to reconstruct this war-torn country cannot proceed effectively.”¹⁸⁷ Failure to stabilise and rebuild Afghanistan could have led to the conditions where the Taliban or another group could wrest control of Afghanistan from the transitional government. The Taliban continued to have support and maintained a presence in the areas bordering Pakistan in the South and South East of Afghanistan. In other parts of Afghanistan there was concern over the influence of local warlords and the control they had over the opium trade which helped finance the Taliban and groups that were sympathetic towards Al-Qaeda. For the Taliban and the warlords, ongoing instability would provide them with the conditions from which

¹⁸⁶ Clark, Helen. *NZDF to lead Afghan Provincial Reconstruction Team*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-lead-afghan-provincial-reconstruction-team>, 22 September 2003.

¹⁸⁷ Clark, Helen. *Further NZ Contribution to Afghanistan, international campaign against terrorism*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/further-nz-contribution-afghanistan-international-campaign-against-terrorism>, 8 March 2004.

they could flourish. To reduce the influence of the Taliban and the warlords it was essential that the central government in Kabul extended its control to the entire country. As this task was beyond the capabilities of the central government in Kabul the international community had to provide the necessary support.

Similarly, concerns regarding the stability of Iraq played a role in the decision to deploy army engineers to assist with the rebuild. The government was concerned about the impact ongoing instability in Iraq could have on the Middle East and the West's relations with the Muslim world.¹⁸⁸ As a strategically important state, continued violence and chaos in Iraq threatened to destabilise neighbouring countries and had the potential to adversely influence the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Any damage to the West's relationship with the Muslim world could impact on the fight against terrorism and lead to an increased risk of a terrorist attack. This included the Asia-Pacific region where the concerns of a terrorist attack had increased after the Bali bombings in 2002.

While the decision to intervene in Afghanistan was primarily motivated by liberal rationale it was not devoid of aspects of realist thinking. The government was keen to improve its relationship with the US, with an eye towards opening free trade negotiations. After the September 11 terrorist attacks the US warned the New Zealand government that its response to the terrorist attacks would impact on the future relations between the two countries.¹⁸⁹ This may have been a significant factor in New Zealand's decision to acquiesce

¹⁸⁸ Goff, Phil. *New Zealand's role in the rebuilding of Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/new-zealand039s-role-rebuilding-iraq>, 12 May 2003.

¹⁸⁹ McCraw, David. 'New Zealand Foreign Policy Under the Clark Government: High tide of Liberal Internationalism', *Pacific Affairs*, 78:2, pp. 229.

to US requests for military support. However, New Zealand's contrasting approaches to the intervention in Afghanistan and the military action against Iraq demonstrate that currying favour with the US was not the primary motivator for the decision to intervene in Afghanistan. While improved relations with the US may have been a positive outcome of the decision to participate in the intervention in Afghanistan it would not have overrode the Labour government's commitment to international law and the UN. If the government believed that any military intervention conflicted with its core ideals, especially in relation to the UN and international law, it is unlikely that it would have participated.

Conclusions

This chapter has demonstrated that the decisions to intervene in the two case studies outside of the Asia-Pacific region are best explained by liberalism. In both case studies New Zealand's core state interests were not threatened, New Zealand also had no real strategic or economic advantages to gain from intervening. The strongest argument for the decisions to intervene is that New Zealand was motivated to uphold the UN and international law. New Zealand's preference for multilateral solutions to international security matters was also evident. From a constructivist point of view, the decisions were influenced by New Zealand's identity as 'good international citizen' that participates in a positive manner to resolve international security issues.

Conclusion

This essay set out to assess the motivations for New Zealand's international interventions, to assess if the motivations were different for the interventions inside the Asia-Pacific region to those outside, and to assess if the approaches taken by the two main political parties in New Zealand were different. While it is difficult to place real life complex situations and decision making into neat theoretical boxes, this essay has found that liberalism provides the best explanation for three of the four case studies. Each case study had a different primary motive, but there was an emphasis on liberal factors such as the protection of human rights and democracy (East Timor), support for the UN (Bosnia), and upholding international law (Afghanistan). This does not mean that realist and constructivist factors did not influence the decision making process, but that they were not the main factor in the majority of the case studies. The exception was the intervention in the Solomon Islands that was primarily motivated by regional security concerns and maintaining New Zealand's relationship with Australia.

The motives for intervening within the Asia-Pacific region differed only slightly from the motivations for intervening outside the region. The intervention in East Timor was motivated by the liberal ideal of protecting the human and democratic rights of the East Timorese. This is consistent with the liberal motives in the decisions to intervene in Bosnia and Afghanistan. However, the intervention in the Solomon Islands demonstrates that New Zealand may intervene on more realist grounds if required. As New Zealand is a regional leader in the Pacific Islands it is more likely that New Zealand will intervene on realist grounds in this region than elsewhere in the world where it has less influence.

While it has been argued that the two main political parties in New Zealand have differing approaches to international relations, the motivating factors for intervening in the four case studies were similar regardless if National or Labour were in government. The similarity between the approaches taken by both of the main parties is also evident by the fact that all the case studies had cross party support, with only minor parties opposing the interventions. Two of the interventions also spanned both parties, with Labour continuing New Zealand's presence in East Timor and National in Afghanistan. This indicates that a comparable response to each of the circumstance may have taken place regardless of which party was governing at the time. The exception here is that the National party argued that New Zealand should have supported the 'Coalition of the Willing' during the invasion of Iraq in 2003, rather than waiting for a UN request to assist with the rebuild. The similarities in the approaches taken by National and Labour does not necessarily mean that the parties will react in a similar fashion in the future. Political parties and the people within them change over time. However, the similarities are an indicator that if and when comparable international situations occur in the future, the approach taken by the two main parties may not diverge significantly.

Bibliography

2005 World Summit Outcome, www.un.org/womenwatch/ods/A-RES-60-1-E.pdf.

Allen, Matthew, and Dinnen, Sinclair. 'The North Down Under: Antinomies of Conflict and Intervention in Solomon Islands', *Conflict, Security and Development*, 10:3, pp. 299.-327.

Aras, Bulent. and Gorener, Aylin. 'National Role Conceptions and Foreign Policy Orientation: The Ideational Bases of the Justice and Development Party's Foreign Policy Activism in the Middle East', *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies*, 12:1, 2010, pp. 73-92.

Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI), *Our Failing Neighbour*, Canberra, APSI.

Benson, leslie. *Yugoslavia: A Concise History*, Palgrave, New York, 2001.

Binder, David. 'Anatomy of a Massacre', *Foreign Policy*, Winter 1994-1995, 70, pp. 70-78.

Bolger, Jim. Ministerial Statement, New Zealand Parliamentary records, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=9&p=11>.

Bolger, Jim. New Zealand Parliamentary debate, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.

Bradford, Max. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Friday 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

Bradford, Max. *NZ Peacekeepers to go to East Timor*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-peacekeepers-go-east-timor>, 16 September 1999.

Burton, Mark. *Minister farewells first deployment to Solomons*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/minister-farewells-first-deployment-solomons>, 23 July 2003.

Burton, Mark. *NZDF involvement in Solomon Islands to be scaled back*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-involvement-solomon-islands-be-scaled-back>, 28 October 2003.

Busse, Nikolas. 'Constructivism and Southeast Asian Security', *The Pacific Review*, 12:1, pp. 39-60.

Bull, Hedley. *Intervention in World Politics*, ed, Bull, Hedley. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984.

Chenoy, Anuradha M. 'The European Union and the Breakup of Yugoslavia', *International Studies*, 33:4, pp. 441-453.

Clark, Helen. *Further NZ Contribution to Afghanistan, international campaign against terrorism*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/further-nz-contribution-afghanistan-international-campaign-against-terrorism>, 8 March 2004.

Clark, Helen. *Government assistance to Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/government-assistance-operation-enduring-freedom-and-iraq>, 9 June 2003.

Clark, Helen. *Infantry company deployment to Solomons*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/infantry-company-deployment-solomons>, 25 August 2003.

Clark, Helen. *NZDF Deployment to Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-deployment-iraq>, 11 August 2003.

Clark, Helen. *NZDF to lead Afghan Provincial Reconstruction Team*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nzdf-lead-afghan-provincial-reconstruction-team>, 22 September 2003.

Clark, Helen. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 18 September 2001, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=2001&m=09&d=18&o=12&p=12>.

Clark, Helen. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 3 October 2001, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=2001&m=10&d=03&o=16&p=31>.

Cooper, Andrew. 'Bosnia vote damages NZ reputation', *The Dominion*, 20 January 1994, pp. 7.

Cottrill, Ross. 'East Timor in Context', *New Zealand International Review*, 24:4, pp. 6-11.

Crawford, John. and Harper, Glyn. *Operation East Timor: The New Zealand Defence Force in East Timor 1999-2001*, Reed Publishing, Auckland, 2001.

Devetak, Richard. and True, Jacqui. 'Diplomatic Divergence in the Antipodes: Globalisation, Foreign Policy and State Identity in Australia and New Zealand', *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 41:2, pp. 241-256.

Dickens, David. 'The United Nations in East Timor: Intervention at the Military Operational Level', *Contemporary Southeast Asia*, 23:2, pp. 213-232.

The Dominion, 'Troop decision against advice, Bolger reveals', 25 May 1994, pp. 1.

The Dominion Post, 'New Zealand's Part in Solomons Sketched Out', 27 June 2003, pp. 1.

Finnemore, Martha. *The Purpose of Intervention*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York, 2003.

Finnemore, Martha. 'Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention', *The Culture of National Security*, ed. Katzenstein, Peter J, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996. pp. 153-185.

Focarelli, Carlo, 'The Responsibility to Protect Doctrine and Humanitarian Intervention: Too Many Ambiguities for a Working Doctrine', *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, 2008, 13:2, pp 202.

Garofano, John. 'Power, Institutions, and the ASEAN Regional Forum: A Security Community for Asia?', *Asian Survey*, 42:3, pp. 502-521.

Glanville, Luke. 'Norms, Interests and Humanitarian Intervention', *Global Change, Peace and Security: Formerly Pacifica Review: Peace, Security and Global Change*, 18:3, pp. 160.

Goff, Phil. 'East Timor: Lessons and implications', *New Zealand International Review*, 24:4, pp. 2-6.

Goff, Phil. 'Global Issues: New Challenges, New Approaches', *New Zealand International Review*, 26:4 July 2001. pp. 2-8.

Goff, Phil. *Goff Meets Armitage in Washington*, www.beehive.govt.nz/release/goff-meets-armitage-washington, 26 September 2001.

Goff, Phil. *New Zealand's role in the rebuilding of Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/new-zealand039s-role-rebuilding-iraq>, 12 May 2003.

Goff, Phil. *NZ assistance to Solomon Islands government*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-assistance-solomon-islands-government>, 15 July 2003.

Goff, Phil. *NZ hopes resolution will clear way for UN role in Iraq*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-hopes-resolution-will-clear-way-un-role-iraq>, 9 May 2003.

Goff, Phil. *NZ's role in peacekeeping and in Afghanistan*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/node/24340>, 10 November 2005.

Goff, Phil, New Zealand Parliamentary Debate 1 July 2003, http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000724/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94-solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and.

Goff, Phil. 'Preventing State Failure', *New Zealand International Review*, 38:2, pp. 2-4.

Goff, Phil. *The UN and Civil Society*, www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/un-and-civil-society, 23 November 2001.

Goff, Phil. *Timor Papers Released*, www.beehive.govt.nz/release/timor-papers-released, 6 September 2002.

Halvorson, Dan. 'Reputation and Responsibility in Australia's 2003 Intervention in the Solomon Islands', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 67:4, pp. 439-455.

Hoadley, Stephen. 'Diplomacy, Peacekeeping, and Nation-Building: New Zealand and East Timor', in *Southeast Asia and New Zealand: A History of Regional and Bilateral Relations*, ed Smith, Anthony, Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2005, pp. 124-144.

Hoffman, Stanley. 'The Problem of Intervention', *Intervention in World Politics*, ed, Bull, Hedley. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1984.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 'The Responsibility to Protect', International Development Research Centre, 2001.

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, 'Research, Bibliography, Supplementary Volume to The Responsibility to Protect, Ottawa: International Development Research Centre 2001.

Jago, Marianne. 'InterFET: An Account of Intervention with Consent in East Timor', *International Peacekeeping*, 17:3, pp. 377-394.

Kang, Taek Goo. 'Assessing China's approach to regional multilateral security cooperation', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 64:4. pp. 406-431.

Katzenstein, Peter J. *The Culture of National Security*, Columbia University Press, New York, 1996

Keene, Edward. 'International Hierarchy and the Origins of the Modern Practice of Intervention', *Review of International Studies*, 39:5, pp. 1077-1090.

Lafraie, Najibullah, 'NATO in Afghanistan: Perilous Mission, Dire ramifications', *International Politics*, 46:5, pp. 550-572.

Lawson, George. and. Tardelli, Luca. 'The Past, Present, and Future of Intervention', *Review of International Studies*, 39:5, pp. 1233-1253.

Leadbeater, Maire. *Negligent Neighbour*, Craig Potton Publishing, Nelson, New Zealand, 2006.

- MacMillan, John. 'Intervention and the Ordering of the Modern World', *Review of International Studies*, 39:5, pp. 1039-1056.
- Malcom, Noel, *Bosnia: A Short History*, New York University Press, New York, 1996.
- Maley, William. 'The UN and East Timor', *Pacifica Review: Peace, Security*, 12:1, pp 63-76.
- McCraw, David. 'New Zealand's Defence Policy: From Realism to Idealism?', *Defence and Security Analysis*, 24:1, pp. 19-32.
- McCraw, David. 'New Zealand's Foreign Policy in the 1990's: In the National Tradition', *The Pacific Review*, 13:4. pp. 577-594.
- McCraw, David. 'New Zealand Foreign Policy Under the Clark Government: High Tide of Liberal Internationalism', *Pacific Affairs*, 78:2, pp. 217-218.
- McDougall, Derek. 'Intervention in Solomon Islands', *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs*, 93:374, pp. 213-223
- McKinnon, Don. *New Zealand Foreign Policy: A Decade of Change*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/speech/new-zealand-foreign-policy-decade-change>, 13 July 1999.
- McKinnon, Don. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 24 May 1994, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1994&m=05&d=24&o=41&p=75>.
- McKinnon, Don. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, Tuesday 7 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=07&o=2&p=8>.
- Mitchell, C.R. 'Civil Strife and the Involvement of External Parties', *International Studies Quarterly*, 4:2, pp. 166-194.
- Moore, R. *NATO'S Partners in Afghanistan: Impact and Purpose*. UNISCI Discussion Papers, Nº 22 (January 2010) pp. 102.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. 'To Intervene or not to Intervene', *Foreign Affairs*, April 1967, 45, pp. 425-436.
- Munro, Mike. 'Poll shows even split on troops for Bosnia', *The Dominion*, 23 April 1994, pp. 2.
- Murphy, Dan and McBeth, John. 'Scorched Earth', *Far Eastern Economic Review*, 16 September 1999, 162:37, pp. 10-14.

Nardin, Terry, 'Policy Brief: The Moral Basis of Humanitarian Intervention', *Ethics and International Affairs*, 2002, 16:1, pp 57-70.

New Zealand Herald, 'Dad's Army dither over Bosnia troops', 7 May 1994, pp. 8.

New Zealand Herald, 'Departments argued over Bosnia policy', 29 July 1994, pp. 5.

New Zealand Herald, 'Troops for Bosnia supported', 7 May 1994, pp. 5.

New Zealand Herald, 'UN Role Not Dominant In NZ-Bosnia Decision', 14 May 1994, pp. 5.

New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 17 September 1999,
<http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

New Zealand Parliamentary Debate , 1 July 2003, http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000724/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and. and http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/debates/debates/47HansD_20030701_00000808/urgent-debates-%E2%80%94solomon-islands%E2%80%94deployment-of-police-and.

O'Brien, Terence, 'New Zealand foreign policy: the importance of reputation', *New Zealand International Review*, 38:5, pp. 20-23.

Orsman, Bernard. 'Bolger Hesitates on Bosnia', *New Zealand Herald*, 21 May 1994, pp. 2.

Orsman, Bernard. 'Malaysia to Press PM', *New Zealand Herald*, 19 May 1994, pp. 1.

Pacific Islands Forum, *Biketawa Declaration*, www.forumsec.org/pages.cfm/political-governance-security/biketawa-declaration/.

Patman, Robert G, 'Globalisation, Sovereignty and the transformation of New Zealand Foreign Policy', Centre for Strategic Studies New Zealand, Working Paper, Victoria University of Wellington, 2005.

Ponzio, Richard. 'The Solomon Islands: The UN and Intervention by Coalitions of the Willing', *International Peacekeeping*, 12:2, pp. 173-188.

Pugh, M.C. 'International Intervention', in UNESCO, *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*. Section 2.3.

Peou, Sorpong. 'Constructivism in Security Studies on Pacific Asia: Assessing Its Strengths and Weaknesses', *Pacific focus*, 17:2, pp. 177-211.

Regan, Patrick. 'Choosing to Intervene: Outside Intervention in Internal Conflicts', *The Journal of Politics*, 60:3, pp. 754-779.

Regional Assistance Mission Solomon Islands, www.ramsi.org/about-ramsi/

Rioux, Jean-Sebastian. 'Third Party Interventions in International Conflicts: Theory and Evidence', paper at the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Halifax: Nova Scotia, 30 May – 1 June 2003. P. 6.

Rosenau, James, N. 'The Concept of Intervention', *Journal of International Affairs*, 1968, 22:2, pp. 165-176.

Rosenau, James, N. 'Intervention as a Scientific Concept', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1969, 13:2, pp. 149-171.

Shipley, Jenny. *MPs to Debate East Timor Peacekeepers*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/mps-debate-east-timor-peacekeepers>. 15 September, 1999.

Shipley, Jenny. New Zealand Parliamentary Debate, 17 September 1999, <http://www.vdig.net/hansard/archive.jsp?y=1999&m=09&d=17&o=3&p=25>.

Shipley, Jenny. *NZ Peacekeepers to go to East Timor*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-peacekeepers-go-east-timor>, 16 September 1999.

Shipley, Jenny. *New Zealand Welcomes Decision to Admit Peacekeepers*, <http://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/new-zealand-welcomes-decision-admit-peacekeepers>, 13 September 1999.

Sunday Star Times, 'McKinnon Wary of Bosnia Troop Request', 24 April 1994, pp. 2.

Snyder, Jack L. *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict*, Norton, New York, 2000.

Thakur, Ramesh, 'Why New Zealand should say no to Bosnia', *New Zealand Herald*, 26 May 1994, pp. 9.

'Townville Peace Agreement', http://www.commerce.govt.nz/Gov/Peace_Agreement.htm.

United Nations Charter, <http://www.un.org/en/Documents/charter/chapter1.shtml>.

United Nations Protection Force, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unprof_p.htm.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 743, [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/743\(1992\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/743(1992)).

United Nations Security Council Resolution 914, [Daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N94/195/62/PDF/N9419562.pdf?OpenElement](http://www.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N94/195/62/PDF/N9419562.pdf?OpenElement).

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1189, [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1189\(1998\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/1189(1998)).

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1214, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/1998/scres98.htm>.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1267, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/1999/sc99.htm>.

United Nations Security Council Resolution 1368, <http://www.un.org/docs/scres/2001/sc2001.htm>.

Voon, Tania. 'Closing the Gap between Legitimacy and Legality of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons From East Timor and Kosovo', *UCLA Journal of International Law and Foreign Affairs*, 2003-2003, pp. 35-36.

Wainwright, Elsin. 'Responding to State Failure: The Case of Australia and Solomon Islands', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 57:3. pp. 485-498.

Walt, Stephen. M. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories", *Foreign Policy*, 110, Spring 1998, pp. 29-46.

Whalan, Jeni. 'The Power of Friends: The Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands', *Journal of Peace Research*, 47:5, pp. 627-637.

Wheeler, Nicholas J. and Dunne, Tim. East Timor and the New Humanitarian Interventionism, *International Affairs*, 77:4. pp. 805-827.

Wilson, James Lindley, and Monten, Johnathan. 'Does Kant Justify Liberal Intervention?', *The Review of Politics*, 73, pp. 633-647.

Waltz, Kenneth. *Theory of International Politics*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1979.

Watkins, Tracy, 'ANZAC tensions over Solomons', *The Dominion Post*, 10 November 2003, pp. 5.

Watkins, Tracy, 'Solomons Concern Minister', *The Press*, 9 July 2003, pp. 6.

Wildman, David, and Bennis, Phyllis, 'The War in Afghanistan goes Global', *Critical Asian Studies*, 42:3, pp. 469-480.