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Resist and Survive:  
Welsh Protests and the British Nuclear State in the 1980s

From the mid 1970s, relations between the superpowers deteriorated, leading to the so-called Second Cold War and an intensification of fears of a nuclear conflict during the early 1980s. In the United Kingdom, these worries were exacerbated by new defence policies – most notably the ‘Protect and Survive’ civil defence programme and the purchase of the Trident nuclear missile system – and the closer relationship with the United States that Margaret Thatcher actively sought and which brought the deployment of American cruise missiles to Britain under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) ‘double-track decision’. There was significant opposition to all these policies and a wave of sustained protests created some of the decade’s enduring images.¹

This was particularly clear in Wales. Local branches of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) staged protests at government bunkers, United States military installations and a Royal Ordnance Factory (ROF) in Llanishen (Cardiff), where components of the warheads for Trident missiles were manufactured. Local authorities established nuclear-free zones and published alternative information on the effects of nuclear war in protest at the line taken in the official civil defence campaign. A group of women organized a march from Cardiff to the base at Greenham Common where cruise missiles were to be stationed, thus laying the foundation for the women’s peace camp outside that military installation. These protests drew together the Labour movement, Welsh nationalists, feminist groups, members of the peace movement and other radicals on the left.² Although this loose coalition helped give a sense of legitimacy to the anti-nuclear lobby in Wales, it was also undermined by the broader political, linguistic, and even ethnic tensions that defined parts of Welsh society.

This article explores the Welsh protests against British nuclear weapons policies. It seeks to promote a four-nations approach to the history of the British nuclear state in order to acknowledge the plurality of experience across the nations of the United Kingdom and illustrate the need for the nuclear threat to be understood as both a local and transnational issue.³ The study builds on the work of scholars who have rooted their analyses of the Cold War within specific places or explored the
spatial dimensions of anti-nuclear activism. Such perspectives have helped establish that anti-nuclear protests were entwined with wider political and moral concerns and even individual circumstances. In both Wales and the rest of the UK, while local authorities, individuals and extra-parliamentary groups certainly dreaded the prospect of nuclear war, the nuclear weapons issue often presented them with a vehicle to protest against government policy more broadly. Indeed, there were times when nuclear weapons were seen as manifestations of wider political problems rather than a self-contained issue in themself. The historiographical appreciation of the multi-causal nature of nuclear protest has also seen the emergence of work that ties nuclear questions to issues of Scottish and Welsh identities, politics and economics, thus demonstrating the plural character of protests across and within the British nations.

However, as with so much of British history, Wales has been underrepresented in scholarship on Cold War and nuclear history. This is despite the sometimes unique nature of the nuclear question in Wales, where it intersected with fears around the endangered cultural, political and economic status of the nation within the UK. Modern Welsh nationhood was built on the twin traditions and cultures of industry and the Welsh language but in the 1980s both were in decline. To the despair of nationalists, in a 1979 referendum, the Welsh electorate had rejected an opportunity to establish an Assembly that would have given the nation its first ever degree of democratic self-governance. The long-term decline in the numbers of Welsh speakers was continuing, especially in its rural heartlands which were simultaneously experiencing the outmigration of young Welsh speakers and the in-migration of older English monoglotes. In industrial areas, manufacturing and the steel and coal industries were in retreat, leading to talk of the death of communities and a way of life. Much of this was blamed on Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative administration but that government also received the support of almost a third of the Welsh electorate in 1979 and 1983, undermining another conception of Wales as a socialist nation. In this context, nuclear weapons were one more destructive threat to a nation already concerned about its demise. Furthermore, they were another sign that the roots of Wales’ fragility lay in governance by a British state run by a Conservative Party with values and a powerbase that lay beyond the Welsh border.

The importance of a Welsh study of nuclear protest goes beyond acknowledging the value of a four-nation approach to British history. Even within Wales, there were different and varying reactions determined by local conditions such
as the importance of defence in a county’s economy or the makeup of its local politics. Nuclear power might transcend borders but it was exercised and resisted at national, regional and local levels. The Cold War was thus an international conflict played out in a multiplicity of national and subnational levels and it has to be placed and understood within the contexts its participants lived in. It requires a polycentric narrative and Wales demonstrates how simultaneously unique and interconnected those different contexts and centres could be.9

**Welsh Protests against Nuclear Weapons**

In 1980, the Home Office published *Protect and Survive*, an information pamphlet telling the public what to do in the event of a nuclear attack. It was first drawn up in 1976 but was then only available to local authorities and the emergency services and only intended to be made public if a war was likely. Its publication in 1980 followed public speculation about its content and whether it was secret.10 When the government made it more widely available, it quickly became the subject of protest because it suggested that nuclear war could be survived and thus potentially minimized people’s understanding of the scale of the threat. On behalf of CND, the historian and leading anti-nuclear-weapons campaigner E.P. Thompson penned a scathing and polemic response under the title *Protest and Survive*; it played an important role in mobilizing anti-nuclear weapons protests and feeling across the United Kingdom.11

One such example was a 1981 booklet produced by Bridgend CND entitled *H-Bomb on Ogwr: A Study of a Nuclear Attack in Wales*. It examined the anticipated effects of two five-megaton hydrogen bombs on south Wales within a larger scenario involving nuclear attacks on 150 strategic and industrial targets across the United Kingdom. The sombre conclusion was that the existing civil defence measures advocated by the government would fail in the event of a nuclear attack on Wales, let alone Britain or Western Europe.12 Its argument was more widely publicized in November 1981 when the radical Welsh magazine *Rebecca* dedicated a title story to local responses to *Protect and Survive*. It imagined thermonuclear attacks on the Royal Air Force (RAF) base at St Athan (South Glamorgan) and the steelworks at Port Talbot (West Glamorgan) in graphic detail, with ‘craters 150 feet deep and a thousand yards wide swallow[ing] the radioactive remains of buildings, vehicles and people’ and each bomb’s flash ‘melt[ing] people’s eyeballs forty miles away’ from ground zero. An accompanying map identified some 30 potential Welsh nuclear
targets thereby illustrating the anticipated vulnerability of Wales in a nuclear war. Besides military installations such as RAF Caerwent (Gwent), RAF St Athan and RAF Brawdy (Dyfed), the map featured urban-industrial centres like Cardiff, Newport and Swansea, and the nuclear power stations at Wylfa and Trawsfynydd (both located in Gwynedd).\(^{13}\)

*H-Bomb on Ogwr* and the *Rebecca* article marked a specifically Welsh response to the defence policies of the British nuclear state. They illustrate that while the nuclear threat may have been one faced by people across the globe, responses to it were very much localized. This was not only a rational way of understanding what otherwise was an abstract concept; it was also a way of mobilizing opposition to the more general threat. Just as propaganda in the Second World War was at its most effective when it appealed to people’s everyday lives rather than grandiose ideas of patriotism, anti-nuclear campaigning worked best when it pointed out the direct threat to people’s own lives and homes.\(^{14}\)

Given Wales’ position on the political and geographical periphery of the UK, and the fact that Wales was long past its height as an industrial zone, it would have been easy for the Welsh population to imagine they were not on the nuclear frontline. Throughout the 1980s campaigners thus repeatedly stressed the likely targets in Wales. They also did so with good reason. In 1981, a study by three members of the School of Peace Studies at Bradford University identified Cardiff and Swansea, as well as the oil refinery in Milford Haven in west Wales as likely targets in a Soviet nuclear strike.\(^{15}\) The government also envisioned Welsh targets. In 1982, it planned a home defence exercise entitled ‘Hard Rock’. The details were meant to be secret but comprehensive information on the scenario imagined was published in the *New Statesman* and repeated in CND literature.\(^{16}\) There were four targets in South Glamorgan (the ROF at Llanishen, Cardiff docks, the US Army transportation terminal at Barry docks and RAF St Athan) and another twelve across south Wales from the US munitions depot and ammunition maintenance facility at Caerwent in the east to the US submarine listening post at Brawdy in the west. CND thought that there might be more Welsh targets and it produced an alternative ‘Burst List’ that envisioned a total of 20 nuclear explosions in Wales.\(^{17}\)

It was the presence of two American military installations that particularly convinced peace protesters that Wales was a likely target.\(^{18}\) The American base at Brawdy, which John Cox, a Welsh chemical engineer, CND activist and author of the
Pelican Books mass paperback *Overkill*, identified as ‘probably the most important target in Britain’, witnessed a major CND demonstration in 1981.\(^{19}\) There were also fears that Wales was vulnerable to attack because of the possibility that the US military was storing nuclear weapons at its munitions depot at RAF Caerwent.\(^{20}\) The secretive atmosphere around the military installations encouraged levels of speculation that reflected a wider distrust of government in Wales. A Plaid Cymru publication speculated that Caerwent’s vulnerability to nuclear attack might have motivated plans by the Welsh Office to move a plastic surgery and burns unit from nearby Chepstow to a location west of Cardiff.\(^{21}\) Concern about the site was exacerbated by revelations about nuclear contamination at a British Army base at Donnington near Telford (Shropshire), which, like Caerwent, was only supposed to be used for conventional arms.\(^{22}\) In April 1982, members of CND set up a peace camp outside Caerwent; it lasted more than three months and drew threats of eviction from Monmouth District Council, and attacks by local residents.\(^{23}\) This was an example of the plethora of small peace camps that existed across Britain and which have been marginalized in the historiography and popular memory by the much larger camp at Greenham Common. Yet, not only were they part of the same movement, they also featured many of the same people. Indeed, the origins of the Greenham Common camp was a group of Welsh women, calling themselves ‘Women for Life on Earth: Women’s Action for Disarmament’, staging a march in 1981 from Cardiff to RAF Greenham Common (Berkshire), where American cruise missile were to be stationed. The women’s camp there remained in place for almost two decades and continued to receive attention from and inspire anti-nuclear weapons activists in Wales.\(^{24}\)

Both the Greenham march and peace camp have been retrospectively associated with feminist peace activism but the peace movement was also becoming a coalition of much wider political movements from the left and it cannot be separated out from the broader context of opposition to Thatcher’s Conservative government and the alienation being generated by spending cuts and rising unemployment.\(^{25}\) Thus, for example, when students marched through Swansea in a 1983 rally that formed part of CND Cymru’s peace week the slogan chanted was ‘jobs not bombs’.\(^{26}\) CND Cymru also explicitly appealed to issues that might draw in those committed to other causes. Although the Ministry of Defence claimed ‘that no “fissile” material’ (the “explosive” part of the bombs’, as protesters put it) was handled at the ROF at Llanishen in Cardiff, CND still maintained that sub-critical uranium 238 and
beryllium might be used there, endangering human health and the environment. Throughout the early and mid 1980s, it argued there was a danger of cancer from materials used in Llanishen and this helped draw in other groups such as the ‘Friday Morning Women’ to its protests at the site. In late 1983, there was a two-day protest and blockade at Llanishen by CND, Christian groups, trade unions (the Transport and General Workers’ Union and the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers), students and others, a clear example of the diversity of the peace movement.

In 1985, CND Cymru wrote of how an unelected emergency committee would govern Wales in the event of a war, and pointed to the claims of a Plaid Cymru MP that this would be ‘devolution without democracy’. Welsh nationalists were an important part of the peace protests and in March 1984 Plaid Cymru held a major rally at the US installation at Caerwent. The party, heavily influenced by Nonconformist ideals of peace, had always been sympathetic to CND and its leader Gwynfor Evans was prominent in the Welsh peace movement from its inception. However, after the defeat of the 1979 devolution referendum, the party increasingly looked to issues that extended beyond its traditional concerns around Wales’ political and cultural position and its three MPs were prominent in anti-nuclear campaigns in this era. This was partly about diversifying the party’s political base but some activists did see direct connections between their political and cultural nationalism and the peace movement. One campaigner, for example, argued that nuclear weapons and attempts to destroy a language were both forms of oppression that must be fought to halt the ‘destruction of what is dear to us’. Nationalists also objected to nuclear weapons because they believed them to be about upholding British prestige and the veneer of being a world power rather than defence. Gwynfor Evans thus denounced Trident as an ‘evil weapon which is a badge of British nationalism rather than a weapon of military defence’.

CND itself also saw its campaign as part of a wider need for social and political justice. Most notably, Welsh members were active in raising money and food to support the miners in their 1984-85 strike. This was partly because of how overtly anti-government that strike was but it was also rooted in an understanding that a strong coal industry undermined the need for nuclear power. The Labour MP Hywel Francis argued that the 1984-85 strike created a coalition of progressive forces and a stronger sense of national identity. One outcome of this was renewed support for Welsh devolution. The peace movement deserves acknowledgement for its role in
forging this coalition, too. Indeed, as Christopher Hill has shown, its contribution to bringing nationalists and the Labour movement together actually stretches back into the 1950s and 1960s, when CND in Wales and Scotland was entwined with emerging nationalist concerns and contributed to progressive left of centre visions for those nations.36

The interweaving of wider political issues with the anti-nuclear question did not always help the peace movement, leaving it vulnerable to accusations of being a ‘lefty’ cause. As a Cardiff student put it in 1980: ‘I think this frightens a lot of people away’.37 Similarly, the Greenham marchers worried that they were alienating those who might associate them with an anti-male feminism.38 A majority of CND activists seemed to have been middle class and that may also not have helped it attract active participation from working-class sympathizers.39 In rural areas CND was often associated with English in-migrants and especially what locals referred to as ‘hippies’. In 1981, a magazine article by Ann Pettitt, one of the driving forces behind the establishment of the Greenham camp, conceded that most of the people in Carmarthen CND were English incomers. She pointed out that this was not surprising because it was the DIY movement and a desire to live a peaceful, self-sufficient lifestyle that had brought them to Wales in the first place.40 Most English incomers into rural Wales were more conventional than that but, at a time when there was considerable concern about the cultural impact of in-migration into Welsh-speaking communities, the association of CND with English ‘hippies’ did not help its cause. In west Wales, such people were, in Pettitt’s own words, ‘outsiders’.41 Even when campaigners tried to address such concerns through symbolic bilingualism, they could find themselves attacked. For example, a 1981 letter to a magazine complained about poor pronunciation by the compère at a CND protest at RAF Brawdy: ‘I find the continual massacre of Yr Hen Iaith [the old language] by self-righteous well meaning outsiders extremely offensive’, it declared.42 Such tensions seem to have contributed to the formation of a CND group in Cardiff specifically to operate through the Welsh language. A report of its formation stated, in Welsh, that ‘Welsh speakers of Cardiff no longer have an excuse, there is a Welsh group for them’.43

In the middle of the decade, anti-nuclear weapon campaigning in Wales lost some of its energy and focus. Amongst nationalists and trade unionists, the 1984-85 miners’ strike perhaps drew some attention and energy away from the peace movement. At the same time, superpower tensions eased in the mid 1980s, making
the outbreak of nuclear war appear less likely. In addition, the reactor accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union in April 1986 raised questions over the safety of the nuclear power stations at Wylfa and Trawsfynydd, and criticism grew over plans for a new reactor at the Hinkley Point nuclear plant opposite Cardiff across the Severn Estuary. The result was some shift in the attention of grassroots campaigners from the threat of war to the safety of nuclear plants and waste.

In early July 1986, Newport CND and CND Cymru thus attempted to revive protests against the Caerwent base by organizing two days of events there. Protesters also renewed their campaign against the US Navy submarine tracking station at Brawdy in rural Dyfed, hoping to raise local opposition to the base. They focused on the fact that it formed such an important part of the United States’ and NATO’s capabilities to detect enemy submarines that it was highly likely to be a chief target in a nuclear war. The Brawdy campaign also aimed to ‘snowball’ into a much broader platform of demands. Apart from calling on the Thatcher Government to vote for multi-lateral nuclear disarmament in the United Nations, it urged the British government to encourage the Reagan Administration to accept proposals to ‘freeze’ its existing nuclear stockpiles. Finally, this ‘snowball’ campaign demanded that Britain should take some steps towards unilateral nuclear disarmament, particularly cancelling the purchase of Trident nuclear missiles.

The renewed protests against US military installations in Wales were again motivated by more than just concern at the nuclear threat. In the aftermath of Ronald Reagan’s order to use British bases to bomb targets in Libya in retaliation for the Lockerbie bombing, British participation in the American Strategic Defense Initiative (‘star wars’) and proposals to store nerve gas at Caerwent, concern rose about Britain’s general complicity in American military aggression. In 1986, protesters thus mounted a ‘campaign to free Wales from US bases’. Cardiff CND’s Radioactive-Times published a map, ‘Wales under the Eagle – US Bases and Military Facilities.’ Besides Caerwent, Brawdy and Barry, it also contained lesser known installations such as the Llanbedr missile range where US Air Force (USAF) F-111 nuclear bombers practiced low-flying exercises, RAF St Athan and Cardiff Rhoose airport, both used as dispersal bases for the USAF and for flying in troops from the United States in the event of rising tensions with the Warsaw Pact. It also featured the nuclear power station at Wylfa on Anglesey, which allegedly bred plutonium for American nuclear weapons.
Since the American bases were beyond the control of the British government and British law, they further raised questions of national sovereignty. In late 1986, it was thus reported that seventeen Welsh Labour MPs, including the party leader, supported the ‘unconditional’ removal of US nuclear bases and a British veto over the use of the others. Legal issues revolving around national security, secrecy and sovereignty also framed a significant part of protests at Barry dock. Central to these concerns was the 1983 US-UK Lines of Communications Agreement, which granted the US military a range of powers in case of war including the declaration of martial law on British soil. In light of Barry dock’s role as a major communications and logistics link for American forces in the event of war on the European continent, CND, South Glamorgan County Council and other nuclear-free local authorities across Britain expressed serious concern over the infringement or even suspension of civil liberties of Barry’s population to allow the US military to move troops and equipment quickly from Barry to airfields in Wales and England via the M4 motorway and the Severn bridge. The New Statesman thus suggested that ‘Mrs Thatcher’s government may have sold out British national interests’. Under the title ‘Our Future – A Secret!’, local CND activist Carol Westall shared her personal experiences about replies to her letters regarding the position of local residents in Barry in the event of crisis and the arrival of large numbers of American troops. She had written to her MP, the Welsh Office, the armed forces, the Home Office and Ministry of Defence, Barry Dock, the US Army and Navy, the US embassy in London, local councillors, trade unions and the health authorities in Cardiff and Barry. None of this produced any answers since the role of Barry dock was classified and could not be made public.

Welsh concerns about nuclear weapons were thus expressed within and about a localized context. This undoubtedly helped protesters connect with wider audiences but it also reflected how the fear of nuclear Armageddon was always imagined at a very personal level. People also connected their wider personal politics to the protests, infusing the pace movement with an association with the left in general, feminism, English in-migration and a distrust of the government’s secrecy and motives. None of these issues was necessarily any more important than the others, and some certainly harmed the peace movement’s popularity, but the nuclear question did bring together individuals and causes that might otherwise have remained disparate.
Local Government and Protests against Nuclear Weapons

‘Though no nuclear weapons are stored there, the base at Brawdy is a certain target for attack and its presence destroys the credibility of Dyfed County Council’s nuclear-free zone,’ observed the Radio-Active Times in 1986. Over the course of the decade, the nuclear question repeatedly added to criticisms of Welsh local government. The Conservative government elected in 1979 believed local authorities to be wasteful and overly left-wing and thus cut both their powers and their funding. In South Glamorgan County Council’s annual report for 1981-82, Rev. Bob Morgan, the authority leader complained of a ‘determined and concerted effort by the national government to denigrate and downgrade local government’. Morgan had become leader of the council when Labour regained control of it in 1981. He was a vicar in a deprived part of Cardiff and had turned to local politics to improve his parishioners’ lot in life and to serve them more effectively than just through being their parish priest. His faith shaped his political convictions and his opposition to nuclear weapons was part of that. The Labour group he led was young and inexperienced, with only seven members that had sat on the council before. Many were from middle-class professional backgrounds and ambitious. Like the party nationally, they were also to the left of where Labour had stood in the 1970s and part of a ‘new urban left’ movement. This emerged in the larger British cities in response to the central government attacks on local authorities and localized concerns at the stagnant and complacent way in which some Labour authorities were being run. It was characterized by the promotion of ideas of equality and inclusiveness and making a stance on international issues such as apartheid. Although some important local work on the promotion of gender and racial equality came out of the ‘new urban left’, it was often gesture politics against the UK’s right-wing government by left-wing authorities whose other responsibilities and limited resources prevented anything more substantial.

The question of nuclear weapons was an obvious target for such local authorities who knew making a stance on the issue would annoy the same government that was curtailing their powers and resources. In November 1980, Manchester City Council’s nuclear-free zone declaration received considerable public attention. This meant very little in reality but its symbolic appeal was significant to the ‘new urban left’ and other authorities followed. In October 1981, a meeting of nuclear-free councils from all over Britain took place, establishing a national steering committee to
direct efforts. In that same month, South Glamorgan County Council declared itself a nuclear-free zone and sought similar action from its twin cities in the Soviet Union and West Germany, Voroshilovgrad and Stuttgart respectively, as a ‘sign of goodwill and peace’. In making its declaration the local authority said it would actively oppose the manufacture and siting of nuclear weapons within South Glamorgan and the transport of any material or components for nuclear weapons through the county. It also decided to publicize a synopsis of its ‘War Plan’ and any other relevant non-classified information’, granted CND permission to mount exhibitions in its libraries and allowed the ‘voluntary showing’ of Peter Watkins’ controversial documentary drama *The War Game* (1965) in the fifth and sixth forms of schools that requested it. Such actions were intended to ensure that the nuclear-free declaration was more than just gesture politics. Most importantly, the council produced a pamphlet entitled *South Glamorgan and Nuclear Weapons*, which was distributed to 200,000 households and paid for from the county’s government funding for civil defence and emergency planning operations, making it the first authority to use the money in such a way. The pamphlet was a direct response to the government’s *Protect and Survive* literature and was intended to be based on research rather than rhetoric. The council had thus consulted expert organizations, including the Medical Campaign Against Nuclear Weapons and Scientists Against Nuclear Arms (SANA). The leaflet attracted considerable attention from within and outside South Glamorgan, especially from other local authorities.

Based on the Home Office’s 1980 Square Leg war game exercise, which designated Cardiff a prime target in a nuclear exchange with the Warsaw Pact, *South Glamorgan and Nuclear Weapons* envisaged a scenario where a one-megaton thermonuclear bomb exploded in an airburst above Cardiff City Hall with devastating consequences. ‘Practically everyone within 2 miles of City Hall would be killed. Nothing would remain. The City Centre and buildings further away such as the Heath Hospital and Llandaff Cathedral would be levelled,’ the pamphlet claimed. Even in the Cardiff suburbs some 3.25 miles away from ground zero, five out of ten people would die and four of the remaining five would suffer injuries, with many survivors later dying from their injuries or from radiation. And in towns like Newport and Pontypridd, some 10 miles or so away from the explosion’s epicentre, buildings...
would be damaged, and ‘[a]nyone looking in the direction of Cardiff at the moment of the explosion would be temporarily, or possibly permanently, blinded’.  

Yet, the leaflet was more than just information about the effects of a nuclear war and it tried to encourage popular activism against nuclear weapons, urging readers to take part in demonstrations, marches, and conferences, and to sign petitions. The booklet declared: ‘STAND UP AND BE COUNTED. THE ARMS RACE MUST BE REVERSED. NUCLEAR WEAPONS MUST BE DISMANTLED! SUPPORT NUCLEAR FREE ZONES.’ Despite this rhetoric, it concluded: ‘You may or may not agree with the County Council, but try to reach your own conclusion. Do not assume that someone else always knows better than you about things like this. The future is in all our hands.’  

Ultimately, the object of the leaflet was to inform people that there was no defence against a nuclear attack. Bob Morgan told a CND newsletter that ‘This is part of our campaign to tell the people the truth. The debate is a public one – we are all in it together. It is our lives and the lives of our children – and the yet unborn – that national politicians are gambling with’. The government itself, however, saw things rather differently. After the council wrote to the Home Secretary about its nuclear-free declaration, it received a curt reply stating the ‘government is aware of the full horrors of war’ but that the ‘aim of civil defence planning is to ensure the future of the millions that will survive’.  

South Glamorgan was the second Welsh county council to declare itself a nuclear-free zone. West Glamorgan had done so as early as July 1981 and Mid Glamorgan and Gwent followed suit in November 1981. These three counties had large Labour majorities but all the other Welsh counties were independent or in the case of Clwyd no party had a majority. Yet, they, too, all declared themselves nuclear-free zones, a testament to the nuclear threat but also the resentment in local authorities over how they were being treated by central government, even if the Powys declaration was passed by just a single vote. When Clwyd became the last Welsh county to declare itself a nuclear-free zone on 23 February 1982, it was claimed that Wales was Europe’s first nuclear-free nation. Clwyd’s declaration was inscribed on vellum intended to resemble a medieval legal document and celebrated by a press reception that brought together figures from Labour, Plaid Cymru and the peace movement. The Chief Druid of the Eisteddfod Bardic circle, a Welsh-language cultural body, read a declaration of Wales as a nuclear-free nation ‘to Europe and the rest of the world’. A CND symbol was set ablaze at the highest point in each county
and there were plans for signs reading ‘YOU ARE NOW ENTERING A NUCLEAR FREE COUNTRY’ to be put up at the border with England. This was all followed by a team of athletes taking a peace torch and the declaration to the President of European Parliament in Strasbourg.69

Nuclear-free Wales was not only home to two nuclear power stations in its north-west but its capital city was the site of an ordnance factory that made the casing for nuclear warheads. While South Glamorgan County Council investigated incidents at the ROF Llanishen to assess their potential impacts on the environment and human health and objected, in principle, to the manufacture of nuclear weapons components within its boundaries, it was not directly involved in protests by activist groups at that installation of the British nuclear state.70 To have been so would have put the authority in the awkward position of undermining an important source of local employment, particularly at a time when it was seeking to boost its declining industrial and manufacturing sector. Other local authorities faced similar dilemmas. In the 1970s, Dyfed County Council had allowed the US naval installation at Brawdy, despite it encroaching onto the Pembrokeshire National Park. It welcomed the economic contribution made by the US and nearby RAF bases and the local press was also hostile to the peace protests targeted at the American facility, claiming they were unrepresentative of local feelings.71 When the US munitions facility at Caerwent was first being planned in the late 1960s, there had been local concerns about the possibility of nuclear weapons being stored there but the local Labour MP had been won over to the cause by assurances that this would not be the case and a promise to discuss handing the land back if it was needed for industrial development.72 The support of the Labour-controlled local authority was also won by promises of 800 civilian jobs at the site. Although only 150 ever materialized, the council’s Labour group was so committed to the project that it expelled a councillor who spoke out against it.73

By the early 1980s, the political climate and the pressure that could be exerted on councillors made local authorities less favourable to these bases but local economic conditions had deteriorated in both rural and urban Wales. In particular coal mining and the steel industry suffered under government economic policies described by Rebecca as ‘the most vicious attack on Welsh living standards since the Thirties’.74 The actual economic contribution of the nuclear and defence industries may not have always matched the initial promises but anything that risked unemployment rising
even further was not going to be popular and thus local authorities did nothing about any contradiction between their status as nuclear-free zones and the existence of American bases, nuclear power stations or even a manufacturer of nuclear weapon components in their counties. It was the symbolism of the zone that mattered.

The position of local authorities was also complicated by their legal responsibilities for emergency planning, which included the occurrence of a war. In the event of a nuclear attack, defence plans anticipated the United Kingdom being governed by a series of regional administrations of which Wales would be one. The Welsh regional government headquarters would be based at Brackla Hill near Bridgend but each county was also expected to function from its own nuclear bunker. The early 1980s thus saw renewed government instructions on what local authorities should do and financial aid to achieve that. However, in the new era of nuclear-free zones, not all were willing to comply and South Glamorgan County Council, for example, refused to upgrade its war room. By summer 1982, a refusal by South, Mid and West Glamorgan, Gwent and Gwynedd, along with 15 local authorities in England, to participate in the ‘Hard Rock’ home defence exercise even forced central government to postpone it indefinitely. The Home Office worried in particular that the exercise was playing into the hands of CND and Labour councils by giving them an opportunity to oppose government policies on nuclear deterrence and civil defence. The fact that the three remaining Welsh county councils demonstrated only ‘limited participation’ in the war game exercise suggested that the Home Office’s fears were right.

In 1984, the year after the Home Office had issued another set of civil defence regulations to local authorities, South Glamorgan, in cooperation with CND Cymru and Cardiff CND, hosted a conference for local Welsh authorities on the in an attempt to formulate a unified and coherent opposition. The conference included a talk on nuclear winter by Michael Pentz of SANA and was preceded by a council-run ‘Peace Week’. By 1986, tensions between central and local governments in Gwynedd and Gwent escalated further when the Home Office threatened to withhold civil defence funding and to appoint commissioners for these two councils should they fail to abide by the regulations on civil defence planning.

Not all local authorities were so reticent however and Dyfed and Mid Glamorgan both planned to upgrade or build new bunkers. The Labour Party had a large majority on the latter and its decision, taken at the exact same time as its
nuclear-free declaration, was further evidence of how such a status was often intended as a symbolic gesture rather than an actual refusal to embrace every aspect of the nuclear state. It was also a reminder of how the ‘new urban left’ was concentrated in the cities rather than in traditional industrial communities such as Mid Glamorgan. However, not every councillor supported the move and senior officials placed pressure on elected representatives to support the bunker, even arguing that not supporting the authority’s civil defence responsibilities could be ‘wilful misconduct’ and that councillors might be disqualified and fined.81

Civil defence, with its ideological underpinnings and physical network of bunkers, formed an integral part of the infrastructure of the British nuclear state at both the national, regional and local levels. It also undermined the coherence of the peace movement by bringing nuclear-free local authorities into conflict with grassroots protesters. Many anti-nuclear weapons activists viewed civil defence with great scepticism, criticizing both its effectiveness against nuclear attack and its exclusivity in only granting selected senior officials access to bunkers. Moreover, they often warned against the imposition of anti-democratic martial law in the event of nuclear war.82

Local authority nuclear bunkers became focal points of protest, with CND Cymru arguing that they were ‘all part of Thatcher’s war plans’.83 It was the bunkers in Dyfed and Mid Glamorgan that attracted the most significant protests. The work to upgrade Mid Glamorgan’s existing war room at Warton led to a picket line at the entrance to the site and non-violent disruption of the construction work. This was led by the local CND but received support from Labour and trade union activists, the loose network of grassroots groups that called itself the Welsh Anti Nuclear Alliance, as well as religious groups, including the United Reformed Church, Welsh Congregationalists and Quakers. Such was the level of controversy caused that the council in the end abandoned its plans.84 There was similar disruption and protests at Carmarthen in Dyfed where the county council was building a new bunker, with financial aid from central government. Protesters had the support of the town’s former Plaid Cymru MP and its current Labour MP. The local authority, however, went as far as taking out a High Court injunction against seventeen protesters to prevent them from accessing or blockading the construction site or inciting others to do so. It also claimed £250,000 in damages from them for conspiracy to trespass. This won the protesters much sympathy, and Dyfed County Council eventually dropped its case.85
Again, the bunker was entangled with broader political concerns that drew support beyond the conventional peace movement. Dyfed County Council’s actions seemed inflated and aggressive and its and Mid Glamorgan’s intransigence over the bunker question both gave the impression of authorities that were profligate and out of touch with their constituents, particularly in a wider climate of local authority service cuts. Local government was never a particularly popular or appreciated institution, and a banner at the Warton protest that read ‘No Bunkers for Bureaucrats’ was an emotive symbol of that.86

**Conclusion**

The protests that took place at military and nuclear installations across Wales are powerful illustrations of how active popular opposition to British, US and NATO nuclear policies during the 1980s was. They stood alongside a campaign of anti-nuclear propaganda whose arguments were conveyed through homemade banners, photocopied leaflets, the pages of the alternative press and slick mass-distributed council leaflets. Together this formed a vibrant protest culture that attempted to draw in wider support by entangling the nuclear threat with general concerns around both government policy and Welsh identity. This was not simply political pragmatism but rather a genuine outcome of how contemporaries made connections between the nuclear threat and the wider state of Welsh, British and global society. For campaigners, trade unionists, councillors, nationalists and concerned citizens, both feeling and articulating an opposition to nuclear war was all part of symbolically and practically opposing the cultural and political direction Thatcher was taking Wales and the wider UK, even if they did not necessarily agree on the precise nature of the problems or solutions. As such, the Welsh anti-nuclear movement demonstrates how the historiography of both the British nuclear state and the Cold War benefits from a polycentric approach to anti-nuclear weapons protests that places opposition to the nuclear threat within wider economies of political and socio-economic concerns.

Hill has argued that the peace movement in the 1950s and 1960s contributed to the ‘making of national identity’ in Wales and Scotland by encouraging visions of those nations that were different to the dominant idea of post-imperial, nuclear-power Britain.87 By the 1980s, the sense of Welsh nationhood that had intensified since the Second World War was under threat from deindustrialization and linguistic decline. Nuclear weapons were not just another threat to the Welsh nation but one that was
being imposed by the same external political forces deemed to be undermining the Welsh economy and culture. Thus the commitments of many nationalists to a nuclear-free Wales intensified because it was a symbol of how Welsh nationalism could protect and create a better Welsh nation. The Labour Party was also increasingly sensitive to the political possibilities of Welsh nationhood and its increasing sense of Welsh identity and difference was visible in its anti-nuclear actions in local government.\textsuperscript{88} However, whichever party was in charge, local authority anti-nuclear campaigns were also intended as deliberate gestures of resistance to a central government that was actively curtailing the powers and status of local government. Thus, by 1985, an estimated 173 British local authorities had declared themselves nuclear-free zones. This raised questions not only about whether such actions were sensible at a time of financial constriction for local councils but also about whether they made local government vulnerable to further attacks from a central government determined to reign in municipal profligacy and politicking.\textsuperscript{89} Such actions were also perhaps not entirely popular. Although the general fear of nuclear war was real, it was only on occasions at the forefront of most people’s minds and support for unilateral disarmament was never widespread.\textsuperscript{90} Local government’s expensive anti-nuclear campaigning may thus have even contributed to its vulnerability to central government cuts and curtailments.

As US-Soviet relations improved in the second half of the 1980s, some of the energy was lost from the Welsh anti-nuclear weapons protests. The Labour movement, in particular, became more focussed on supporting the 1984-5 miners’ strike. Local government, too, moved away from gesture politics to concentrating on protecting its service delivery and working on supporting economic development, something which required close co-operation with the Welsh Office. Yet, this does not diminish the significance of what happened in the early and mid 1980s. It remains an important example of how the anti-nuclear weapons movement should be put in a wider context that acknowledges the role of other causes in both contributing to and distracting from its vibrancy. One of those contexts is the multinational nature of the United Kingdom. There was no uniform understanding of or response to the nuclear weapons question within the UK. Indeed, the question was itself actually part of the long-term process where a multiplicity of issues were interpreted and responded to within a Welsh context, a process that ultimately led to Welsh devolution in 1997. Welsh protests against nuclear weapons in the 1980s not only signified an attempt to
ensure the physical survival of the Welsh nation, but they also addressed a set of broader issues such as the preservation of Welsh identity, culture and language, as well as a struggle for survival between local authorities and central government over financial and governance issues. In this sense, resist and survive mattered beyond the hypothetical threat of nuclear war; it was also much more immediate questions of resistance and survival.
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