

WORKING PAPER NO. 374

**TRANSFORMATION OR STAGNATION?:
RETHINKING AUSTRALIA'S DEFENCE**

Alan Dupont

*Canberra
May 2003*

National Library of Australia
Cataloguing-in-Publication entry:

Dupont, Alan, 1950- .
Transformation or Stagnation?:
Rethinking Australia's defence
ISBN 0 7315 5431 0.

1. National security - Australia. 2. Terrorism - Australia.
3. Australia - Defences 4. Military policy.

I. Title. (Series : Working paper
(Australian National University. Strategic
and Defence Studies Centre) ; no.374).
355.033594

Strategic and Defence Studies Centre

The aim of the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, which is located in the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies in the Australian National University, is to advance the study of strategic problems, especially those relating to the general region of Asia and the Pacific. The centre gives particular attention to Australia's strategic neighbourhood of Southeast Asia and the Southwest Pacific. Participation in the centre's activities is not limited to members of the university, but includes other interested professional, diplomatic and parliamentary groups. Research includes military, political, economic, scientific and technological aspects of strategic developments. Strategy, for the purpose of the centre, is defined in the broadest sense of embracing not only the control and application of military force, but also the peaceful settlement of disputes that could cause violence.

This is the leading academic body in Australia specialising in these studies. Centre members give frequent lectures and seminars for other departments within the ANU and other universities and Australian service training institutions are heavily dependent upon SDSC assistance with the strategic studies sections of their courses. Members of the centre provide advice and training courses in strategic affairs to the Australian Department of Defence and Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Regular seminars and conferences on topics of current importance to the centre's research are held.

Since its inception in 1966, the centre has supported a number of visiting and research fellows, who have undertaken a wide variety of investigations. Recently the emphasis of the centre's work has been on problems of security and confidence-building in Australia's neighbourhood; the defence of Australia; arms proliferation and arms control; policy advice to the higher levels of the Australian Defence Department; and the strategic implications of developments in Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean and the Southwest Pacific.

Publications Program

The centre maintains a comprehensive collection of reference materials on strategic issues. Its publications program, which includes the Canberra Papers on Strategy and Defence and SDSC Working Papers, produces up to two dozen publications a year on strategic and defence issues. An abridged list of SDSC publications appears at the end of this volume.

Editorial Board

Professor Paul Dibb
Professor Desmond Ball
Professor David Horner
Dr Alan Dupont
Dr Coral Bell
Professor Anthony Milner
Professor Virginia Hooker
Professor Ross Babbage

SDSC Working Papers

Series Editor: Meredith Thatcher
Published and distributed by:
Strategic and Defence Studies Centre
The Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200
Australia
Tel: 02 6125 9921
Fax: 02 6248 0816

Transformation or Stagnation? Rethinking Australia's Defence¹

by Alan Dupont

Introduction

Since the tragic Bali bombing few would dispute the proposition that Australia's security environment is in the midst of one of the most profound and far-reaching changes in recent history or that the emergence and intensification of a raft of transnational threats, especially international terrorism, is a principal cause.² But there is little agreement on how to balance our response to the new transnational challenges with the long-standing requirement to defend against more traditional threats to our sovereignty and way of life. This tension is particularly evident in the widening debate over defence strategy. Traditionalists contend that the thirty year focus on defending Australia against military attack from a hostile state should remain the principal determinant of the structure and capability of the Australian Defence Force (ADF). They argue that other tasks such as counter-terrorism, peace-keeping and operations other than war, while important, are second order issues for the ADF. And they reject as dangerous, and misguided, any attempt to alter the underlying tenets of strategic planning first laid down in the landmark 1986 Dobb Review.³

In this review, defence academic Paul Dobb postulated the Defence of Australia (DOA) founded on a strategy of denial, highly capable maritime assets and layered defence. Its central aim was to defeat an attack on Australia by defending the so-called 'sea-air gap' to the north and east of the continent which Dobb saw as a formidable barrier to any enemy. As a result, the primary defence role was vested in maritime forces with the ability to strike hostile forces at considerable distance from the Australian mainland and to interdict their lines of supply, with the Army reduced to mopping up any hostile ground forces that made it to Terra Australis.⁴ This led to a substantial reallocation of resources to the Navy and Air Force and a serious hollowing out of Australia's land forces over the subsequent decade and a half which some contend almost proved disastrous in the 1999 East Timor intervention.⁵

More fundamentally, critics of the defence orthodoxy assert that our strategy is outdated and fixated on threats that are improbable and unrelated to the real world. Defence Minister Robert Hill lent considerable weight to this view in a seminal speech on defence and security to the Australian Defence College. Hill described a world in which asymmetric threats had

moved from an academic abstraction to “an appalling reality” revealing starkly “the new contours and fault lines of a very different strategic landscape.”⁶ The Minister conceded that many elements of the landscape were not new and modern, capable armed forces were still required for high-end warfare. And he reserved judgement on the question of whether or not the 11 September 2001 terrorist attack on the US was a truly transformational event. But Hill made it abundantly clear that geostrategic considerations should no longer define Australia’s military posture and priorities because security, like everything else, had become globalised. In a pointed reference to the map featured at the end of the Dobb Review, Hill remarked that “it probably never made sense to conceptualise our security interests as a series of diminishing concentric circles around our coastline, but it certainly does not do so now.”⁷

The Minister made three other observations that ran counter to the prevailing view in his own department. First, the ADF is increasingly likely to be deployed beyond Australia because our security responsibilities are not confined to the region.⁸ Second, the ADF must be able to cope with a broader spectrum of threats including non-traditional challenges to security which have often been viewed by the military as “something of a side-show, a distraction from their core business of preparing for and conducting ‘high-end’ war-fighting.”⁹ Third, referring to the multiplying demands on defence and the more intense and diverse use of the ADF over the past decade, Hill directly challenged the orthodoxy by asserting that this had very significant implications for the way the ADF is structured and equipped.¹⁰

Are these criticisms valid? I argue that Hill is fundamentally right. If anything, he may not have fully appreciated the extent of the mismatch between strategy, force structure and the emerging threats to Australia’s security. Our defence strategy is firmly rooted in the past having remained essentially unchanged since the Dobb Review almost twenty years ago despite the enormous transformation that has taken place in our security environment. Adjustments have been largely cosmetic, and at the margins of policy, as evidenced by the refusal of a succession of official defence white papers to countenance any significant revision of force structure. Our current strategy has four major deficiencies. It is based on a misplaced geographical determinism that ignores the diverse and globalised nature of modern conflict; it has shaped the ADF for the wrong wars; it gives insufficient weight to the transnational threats which confront us; and it fails to recognise that modern defence forces must win the peace as well as

the war. What Australia needs is a strategy for the future, not the past, and a transformed ADF structured to manage the very different security challenges of the 21st century.

Geography and the global village

For nearly three decades, the underlying assumption of our defence policy has been that proximity ought to determine strategic import. Traditionalists insist that geostrategic imperatives should shape strategy as well as force structure, an idea that finds visual expression in Dobb's map of Australia and its radiating concentric circles. This linear view of defence holds that protecting Australia from conventional military threats must be the primary mission of our defence forces, a conceptualisation of Australia's security dilemma that is heavily influenced by classical balance of power considerations. Our military strength is customarily measured against the capabilities of our Asian neighbours and acquisitions justified largely in terms of maintaining a strategic or technological edge over them. Geographical determinism also drives the argument that Australia's preparedness to deploy the ADF ought to diminish in inverse proportion to the distance from continental Australia. The alleged virtue of this approach is that it disciplines defence spending, provides a coherent strategic rationale for capability planning and enables Australia to better deal with regional uncertainty because of the tight focus on defending Australia.¹¹ At the same time traditionalists are quick to pour cold water on the idea that the ADF should structure for more distant contingencies beyond the 'inner arc' because, from their perspective, a hostile power could only seriously threaten Australia by establishing bases in the archipelago to our north.¹²

This is a surprisingly narrow and one dimensional view of strategy that has more in keeping with the world of Halford Mackinder than Osama bin Laden.¹³ In the age of globalisation and transnational threats, geography matters far less than it once did because of the compression of space and time. This is not to argue that geography has no impact on strategy. As long as the notion of sovereignty is embodied in territorial boundaries and physical variations in the land, water and sky affect human existence, geography will continue to exert an influence on the conduct of war. But as the world has become painfully aware, state and non-state adversaries can strike from great distances in conventional as well as unconventional ways. The arena of conflict is no longer defined by national borders or neat lines on a map. War like trade, information and money has been globalised and political, strategic and economic forces have become so potent and interconnected that the boundaries between domestic and international security are today seldom clear cut. One country's political instability may

quickly become another country's security crisis or a problem for the wider international community as East Timor, Somalia, Bosnia, Rwanda, Afghanistan and a host of other internal conflicts, many of them distant from Australian shores, remind us.

Despite traditionalists' insistence that the ADF should be configured for the defence of Australia and its maritime approaches in reality, as Defence Minister Robert Hill observes, the ADF has been continuously deployed well beyond Australia's shores on a wide range of missions and tasks for over a decade.¹⁴ If deployments beyond our immediate neighbourhood were occasional, or of a minor nature, it would be easier to sustain the argument that these should be viewed as ad hoc tasks that require no change to strategy or force structure. On the contrary, they have been the norm rather than the exception because Australia has important security interests that are not confined to our immediate region and may require the use of military force or defence resources. If the events of the past decade are any guide, ADF deployments beyond the sea-air gap will increase rather than diminish as coalitions of the willing are formed and re-constituted for a variety of tasks unrelated to the planning scenarios that have informed our strategy since Vietnam.

The great conceptual weakness of the Defence of Australia (DOA) doctrine and its associated maritime strategy is that it is based on a notion of threat that takes little account of the declining strategic relevance of geography and the proliferation of non-military, non-state challenges to security. The sea-air gap to the north, or Australia's 'moat' as it is sometimes called, conjures up the image of a protective barrier that can be defended by military force and encourages us to believe that Australia "is a secure country thanks to our geography."¹⁵ But this is a dangerous illusion in a world of technological profusion, protean crime, epidemic diseases, illegal migration and stateless enemies as the Bali bombing and other terrorist outrages demonstrate.¹⁶ DOA is analogous in its thinking to the 'Maginot Line' mentality that proved so disastrous to the French in the Second World War. In an interconnected world, drawing lines on a map is unlikely to deter agile, asymmetric foes and should not inform the structure or deployment of the ADF.

Moreover, the maritime strategy that underpins DOA is a maritime strategy in name only. A true maritime strategy, based on the use of substantial naval power to control major sea lines of communication, or to contain continental powers, is well beyond Australia's capability.¹⁷ However, the real problem with the maritime strategy is that the so-called sea-air gap is not a gap at all. It is an archipelago occupied by numerous

islands of varying importance, size and population where any conceivable military operation would require the effective use of land forces including the means to transport and sustain them.¹⁸ For traditionalists who pride themselves on their understanding of the strategic importance of geography, the failure to recognise the archipelagic nature of the northern approaches to Australia is an inexcusable misappreciation. To assume that an enemy could be deterred or subdued primarily by air and naval power ignores the lessons of history in general, and Australian history in particular.

When Japanese forces advanced into New Guinea during World War II, they were prevented from attacking Australia by a vigorous ground campaign along the Kokoda Trail. Before the ink was dry on the Dibb Review, the Fiji coup of 1987 should have alerted Defence to the likelihood that the requirement for mobile, autonomous land forces able to deploy at short notice beyond the sea-air gap would almost certainly increase.¹⁹ Yet in committing so much of the defence budget to the Navy and Air Force at the expense of the Army, the “gatekeepers of strategic doctrine” pursued a policy that severely weakened the Army’s capacity for force projection in the mistaken belief that air and naval power would suffice. This flawed policy was maintained despite a dramatic increase in the Army’s operational tempo during the 1990s and in the face of professional, military advice.²⁰ It was only towards the end of the decade that the Army was permitted to develop a limited capacity for littoral operations. But as East Timor showed, this shift was too little and too late.

Against whom will we fight? Assessing risk

A second, fundamental failing is that the ADF is structured for the wrong wars. DOA assumes that the most dangerous threat to Australia is a conventional military attack on Australian soil from a hostile, well-armed state. Interestingly, DOA advocates do not suggest that this is the most probable military contingency. On the contrary, they concede that a direct military attack is unlikely, or even “highly unlikely”, but that since a military attack would be a serious event, with potentially grave ramifications for Australia’s security, prudent decision-makers must consider outcomes as well as probability.²¹

This curious inversion of strategic logic contradicts the first principle of risk management, namely that the consequences of an action must be carefully weighed against the probability of its occurrence. To argue that a highly unlikely event should command the lion’s share of an organisation’s resources or be the principal focus of its attention would not get past first base in the political or corporate world. It is certainly not the basis for a

sensible defence strategy given the diversity and immediacy of the security challenges now confronting the ADF. One could also question the wisdom and utility of capability based planning where strategy and force structure is developed in response to hypothetical and generalised threat typologies. This might have made sense in the benign 1980s when there were few visible storm clouds on Australia's strategic horizons. But there are enough dangers in evidence today, many of them on our own doorstep, to predicate our defence strategy on real threats rather than imagined ones.

Furthermore, the assumption that a conventional military attack on Australia is necessarily the most serious security threat Australia could face, justifying placing most of our defence assets in the DOA basket, is fallacious. As the Japanese discovered in World War II, deploying a credible military force to Australia's neighbourhood and sustaining it for any length of time would be an immense undertaking and beyond the capability of any state other than the US.²² This leaves only second order contingencies for the ADF to defend against of the kind identified in the Dibb Review. None of these, by definition, would be catastrophic or grave in the sense that they would threaten the survival of the state or necessarily result in large numbers of casualties. Weapons of mass destruction (WMD), on the other hand, could wreak extremely high levels of death and destruction and this threat has become far more acute because such weapons may now be in the hands of terrorists. However, surprisingly little attention has been paid to the WMD threat in our white papers in the mistaken belief that Australia is either largely quarantined from such attacks or else impotent to defend against them.²³

So who is going to attack Australia? Traditionalists tend to dance around this question without actually answering it. Sometimes they indulge in blatant threat inflation or suggest, more subtly, that a general deterioration in the regional security environment and growing levels of military capability could translate into a specific military threat to Australia. The alleged 'arc of crisis' to Australia's north has been a convenient peg to hang arguments for increased military spending or to endorse a strategic posture that bears little or no relationship to the region's underlying problems which are overwhelmingly economic, social and environmental. Often such notional threats are devoid of any plausible political context. A prime example is the assertion that a major power could lodge in the archipelago to our north and threaten Australia militarily from bases established there. But there is no accompanying explanation as to how this could occur without precipitating a major regional conflagration or drawing a countervailing US response.

Of course it is easier to invoke threats rather than dismiss them since there is always some prospect that they could materialise, if not now, then at some unspecified point in the future. However, like insurance brokers and political leaders, defence planners must gauge the probability of real dangers arising and not conjure up remote threat scenarios. To do otherwise makes a mockery of the strategic planning process and begs the question of why we have expensive, well-resourced intelligence agencies whose business it is to appraise risk. Divining the intentions and capabilities of potential adversaries are the keys to assessing strategic risk. So, using these as our yardsticks, which states might conceivably threaten Australia militarily over the next decade and a half, the generally accepted time frame for long-term strategic planning? According to DOA theology, only a major power or neighbour would have the motivation and the capability. If fellow democracies and alliance partners, the US and Japan, are ruled out along with a weakened Russia, this leaves only India, Indonesia and China as genuine contenders.

Although India has occasionally featured in Australian threat assessments, notably during the late 1980s when the Indian Navy embarked on a short-lived and ill-fated expansion program, it is difficult to envisage the circumstances in which India might contemplate military action against Australia. There are no deep-seated ideological differences, territorial disputes or historical grievances between us. On the other hand, there are many ties that bind, not least of which are a shared colonial heritage, common democratic institutions, membership of the Commonwealth and burgeoning trade links. Even if one could imagine a situation in which Australia-India strategic competition resulted in an outbreak of military hostilities, India does not have anything like the requisite power projection capability to seriously endanger Australia's territory, trade routes or sea lines of communication. And it could not acquire the capability for at least a decade, even under the most pessimistic set of threat assumptions.

What about Indonesia? If bilateral relations were to deteriorate over Papua or East Timor, Jakarta might contemplate military action against Australian territory or the interdiction of trade routes passing through the archipelago that carry vital Australian exports to Northeast Asia. There have been several periods of acute tension in the past that, on two separate occasions, have led to confrontation between Indonesian and Australian troops in Borneo (1964-65) and East Timor (1999). And it is not beyond the bounds of possibility that a hostile government could come to power in Jakarta intent on creating problems for Australia. Nevertheless, the probability of major military conflict between Australia and Indonesia must

be rated as extremely low. Even during the worst months of the East Timor imbroglio in late 1999, the channels of communication between Canberra and Jakarta were sufficiently well established to avoid serious clashes. Both countries accept that they would have much to lose politically and commercially because of their growing interdependence. The failure of Islamists in August 2002 to amend the constitution and allow the implementation of sharia law suggests that Indonesia will remain a moderate, secular state, albeit one prone to periodic bouts of domestic violence, lawlessness and Islamic militancy.

Those who argue that Indonesia represents a military threat to Australia ignore the parlous state of the Indonesian Armed Forces (TNI). Only about 35,000 troops in the 230,000-strong Army are capable of effective combat operations and TNI has a minimal and declining ability to operate beyond its borders because of the moribund state of the navy and air force.²⁴ The Chief of the Indonesian Navy admitted, in July 2002, that none of his 113 ships were fit to fight, while another senior naval officer conceded that the Indonesian Navy was having extreme difficulty in maintaining enough ships on station to combat pirates due to the vessels' age and condition.²⁵ The Air Force is in little better shape operating under severe financial constraints with largely obsolescent aircraft. Out of a total of 222 aircraft only 93 are able to fly and one third of Indonesia's air defence radars are not fully functional.²⁶ The reality is that weak states, like Indonesia, do not have the resources to mount invasions or cut trade routes. They pose security problems of an altogether different kind in the form of internal instability and the proliferation of low intensity conflicts that may spill over and draw in Australians as peace makers and peace keepers. They also provide a favourable environment for terrorist and criminal activities that may necessitate an ADF response, but of a far different kind to that envisaged by our current strategy.

Indonesia aside, it is the middle-kingdom which casts the deepest shadow over Australia's encircling moat, or so traditionalists would have us believe. Scratch the surface of Australia's defence community and it is not hard to elicit concerns about China's rising power, the acquisition of a blue water fleet and the purchase of advanced fighter aircraft and military technology from Russia. But why would China want to assault Australia militarily? More than two decades after senior leader Deng Xiaoping began the process of transforming China from a revisionist to a status quo power, Beijing is now a fully paid up member of the capitalist community, notwithstanding occasional rhetorical genuflections to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism. China would have much to lose from any attempt to threaten

Australia, given our increasing importance as a trading partner and source of raw materials. Despatching the PLA to the sea-air gap would fundamentally challenge the existing balance of power, virtually guaranteeing a US military response as well as inviting global condemnation that would severely damage China's international standing.

However, the real weakness of the China threat argument is that the PLA could neither deploy substantial forces to the archipelago in the timeframe under consideration nor sustain them for any length of time. To do so would require the construction of a blue water navy replete with the aircraft carriers necessary to provide air cover for amphibious forces. China could not acquire such a capability within the next decade. Currently, the PLA's SU-27 fighter aircraft only have a loiter time of 30 minutes over the Spratly Islands from forward bases on the mainland. Even the acquisition of more capable SU-30s and aerial refuelling would not allow the Chinese Air Force to support naval and ground forces over northern Australia on a continuous basis.²⁷

What wars will we fight?

None of this is to argue that Australia faces no military threats, only that those customarily posited are short on analysis and long on hypothesis. So what kind of wars will the ADF have to fight? It is commonly assumed that the ADF will be pitted against the armed forces of another state that are organised, equipped and trained to fight conventional wars. But such wars are increasingly unlikely. Iraq is the exception, not the rule. The massed tank battles seen in the final stages of the Gulf War was the last punctuation of a military era that began with the First World War and ended in the final triumph of the US military machine which now commands decisive battlefield superiority over all other states.²⁸ More than a decade ago, the Israeli military historian, Martin Van Creveld, forecast that conventional military wars between the regular, armed forces of sovereign states would decline in frequency and duration while low intensity conflict within states conducted by warlords, criminals, insurgents, militias, terrorists and paramilitary groups would increase.²⁹ He surmised that such conflicts were most likely to occur in the developing world. These predictions have been dramatically borne out in the decade since Van Creveld audaciously challenged the Clausewitzian universe.³⁰

Separatism, ethnic struggles, guerrilla insurgencies, armed criminal challenges to the state and terrorism are today more frequent than interstate war and the security consequences no less severe.³¹ On the other hand, major wars between states over territory, ideology and power-balancing are

declining in frequency and magnitude. This is so because the incentives for resolving disputes or acquiring wealth through military force have diminished in post-modern societies while the disincentives have increased enormously.³² Countries fully integrated into global capital markets are unwilling to risk the economic disruptions that war inevitably brings, casualty aversion is rife and the pool of military recruits is dwindling. Global norms are changing too, making it more difficult to prosecute wars without incurring international opprobrium or inviting sanctions. Poorer, less developed states are preoccupied with the problems of governance and national survival. The Cold War era of proxy wars has passed into history. Without superpower patrons, developing states seldom have the means to fund expensive wars with neighbours.

The figures bear testimony to this shift. Of the 120 armed conflicts fought during the Cold War, most were between states and eleven accounted for more than 200,000 casualties each. By contrast, the great bulk of those recorded since 1989 have been internal, a trend that has intensified in recent years. Of the 15 deadliest conflicts globally in 2001 (those that caused 100 or more deaths), all were intrastate and 11 spilled over borders to destabilise neighbouring states.³³ Australia's own experience is illustrative. The ADF has repeatedly been deployed on international peace-keeping and peace-enforcement missions that bear little resemblance to the kinds of wars anticipated or deemed worthy of serious consideration by a generation of Australian defence planners. There is, in fact, a worrying disjuncture between their fixation with war between states and the rise in intrastate conflict globally, especially in our own region.³⁴

Moreover, organised violence is no longer the exclusive preserve of states. Some non-state actors have at their disposal resources and influence that may equal, or even exceed, those of many states. Many are neither benign nor reluctant to use force. The internationalisation of crime and the criminalisation of war have become key strategic issues underlining the complexity of the transnational challenge to security. The borderless world in which transnational criminal organisations operate offers numerous opportunities for the acquisition of illicit wealth. Based on its narcotics revenue alone, the Italian mafia is estimated to be richer than 150 sovereign states, while the Chinese triads and Japanese yakuza make profits that would be the envy of most large multinationals.³⁵ War has been criminalised in many parts of the world including in the Asia-Pacific where transnational criminal groups have demonstrated a penchant for high levels of violence and a capacity for military action rivalling that of national defence forces.

In Burma, for example, the United Wa State Army (UWSA), dominates the Asian heroin and amphetamine trade and provides the military muscle and protection for the drug caravans that ply their trade in the tri-border region of Burma, Thailand and Laos.³⁶ Its 15,000 to 20,000 troops are well armed and equipped with mortars, heavy machine-guns and Russian made SA-7 surface-to-air missiles, which makes the UWSA a formidable military force by any standard and arguably the most potent narco-insurgency in the region.³⁷ In the Philippines, the criminal excesses of the Abu Sayyaf have fuelled Mindanao's entrenched ethno-religious conflicts. Among the island states of the Pacific, random criminal violence as well as the activities of organised criminal gangs have become the principal threats to national and regional security.

Over all this hangs the menacing cloud of international terrorism and what Christian Reus-Smit calls "the revisionist violence of anti-systemic movements."³⁸ One does not have to see the attack of 11 September 2001 as a paradigm shift in international relations to acknowledge that the new age of terrorism has major implications for Australia's national security and defence strategy. The reasons are threefold. First, 11 September and its aftermath demonstrated the global reach of al Qa'ida and its capacity to forge transnational, strategic alliances with like-minded groups far from the organisation's home base in Afghanistan. Operating like a modern, transnational corporation al Qa'ida recruits from, or cooperates with, established indigenous movements that share common goals, values and ideology. In Southeast Asia, al Qa'ida networks with Abu Sayyaf and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in the Philippines; Laskar Jundullah in Indonesia; the Kumpulan Mujahideen Malaysia (KMM) and the now infamous Jemaah Islamiyah which has clandestine cells across the region.³⁹ The existence of these extensive terror networks is historically unprecedented. While European anarchists and pre-modern terrorists occasionally joined together in common cause, their capacity for coordinated, international action was considerably less than that of al Qa'ida.

Second, today's terrorists are far more likely to obtain and use WMD to achieve their political aims. While their capacity to wreak destruction does not yet compare with that of the Cold War when the world lived with the constant threat of nuclear war, terrorists are much more likely than states to use nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. In effect, terrorists have lowered the WMD threshold, exploiting the dark side of technology to turn plough-shares into weapons and threatening what Neil Livingstone has labelled "mega-death."⁴⁰ In their 1993 attack on the Japanese subway system, the Aum Shinrikyo (Supreme Truth) group demonstrated an impressive

capability to weaponise virulent biological agents. Other terrorist groups will seek to emulate them, perhaps aided and abetted by rogue states. Thus, contemporary terrorism can be distinguished from its historical antecedents by the magnitude of its effect as well as global reach.

Third, while terrorists and criminals have demonstrated an impressive and sometimes lethal capacity to perpetrate violence, they seldom do so in conventional ways. They have no armoured divisions, aircraft carriers or squadrons of advanced fighter aircraft at their disposal. But they fight asymmetrically, using surprise, deception, detailed planning, networking and the selected use of advanced technology as well as cruder instruments of violence to combat the generally superior firepower at the disposal of the states they seek to undermine. These are the classical techniques of guerrilla warfare adapted to the urban jungles of first and third world states. However, the prospect of the ADF having to engage in urban warfare barely rates a mention in the white paper although it is now exercising the collective minds of the best strategists in the US and Europe.⁴¹ This is despite the fact that Australia is one of the most urbanised countries in the world and other regional states are rapidly proceeding down the same path. In 1990, for example, 30 percent of Indonesians lived in large cities. By 2025, however, this will double to 60 percent. In fact, the vast majority of the region's population will soon be living in urban agglomerations, which is a change of historic proportions for previously rural, agrarian Asia.⁴²

Of course, asymmetric wars will not only be fought by terrorists and criminals. Other armed groups, who inhabit the lower reaches of the threat spectrum, will fight hybrid forms of warfare where modern, conventional weapons systems may be of limited use. Somalia is perhaps the pre-eminent example of a conflict in which overwhelming US firepower was blunted by a canny warlord's effective use of urban warfare and superior local knowledge to force a humiliating withdrawal. Mohammed Farah Aidid was also adept in the art of information warfare, allowing his jubilant followers to drag the defiled bodies of dead US special forces personnel through the streets of Mogadishu in front of a CNN camera, thereby turning a military defeat into a stunning political victory. Somalia, as James Adams has written, "was a salutary lesson for the military in the limitations of modern warfare."⁴³

Experienced professionals, like General Charles Krulak of the US Marine Corps, believe that future wars may be the step-child of Somalia and Chechnya rather than the son of Desert Storm.⁴⁴ Certainly, Australia's own experience suggests that we should give a far higher priority to the very real possibility that future wars may have more in common with the tribalism

and anarchic savagery of the Middle Ages than the structured conflicts of the Cold War. For conventionally armed and organised defence forces, like the ADF, the difficulty of responding to asymmetric threats is compounded by the need to retain capabilities to fight pre-modern as well as post-modern conflicts. The US Marine Corps has explicitly recognised the increasingly hybrid nature of contemporary conflict by conceptualising the notion of 'three-block war'. Thus, "in one city block, a Marine will provide food, care and comfort to an emaciated child. In the next block you will see this Marine with outstretched arms, separating two warring tribes. Then, in a third city block, this same Marine will engage in intense house-to-house fighting with hostile forces."⁴⁵ Three-block war is a far more realistic characterisation of the ADF's future operational environment than the threat scenarios that underpin DOA. We sometimes forget that nearly 80 percent of the world's people live in pre-industrial, marginalised societies that are prone to violence and endemic conflict. For both the US Marine Corps and the ADF, dealing with messy, chaotic third world conflicts involving peace-keeping and nation-building tasks is the real challenge ahead.⁴⁶

Our commitment to Somalia was very much in this vein as was East Timor, where the ADF was confronted by a rag tag band of anti-independence militia supported by elements of the Indonesian armed forces. However, East Timor was not in the script of any white paper, nor did it fit the preconceptions of our maritime strategy. In East Timor, Australia was forced to deploy, at very short notice, nearly half the Army's combat force in a conflict where the enemy bore more than a passing resemblance to Aidid's rapacious irregulars. The requirement was for boots on the ground, but the boots were in sore need of repair - not only boots but also many other basic military items. Camouflage suits, night vision goggles and water purification plants all had to be borrowed from the Americans as they were in such short supply.⁴⁷

But East Timor showed up far more serious flaws in our force structure and strategy. It is not generally appreciated what a near run thing East Timor was for our \$14 billion dollar defence force. The ADF only just managed the INTERFET commitment because the government made the prudent decision to increase the size of the severely depleted Army by two battalions, and we were able to cannibalise other units to make up the numbers and provide our soldiers with the right equipment and support. Other serious deficiencies were directly attributable to an inflexible and increasingly out of touch strategy that privileges high-end warfare and pays insufficient attention to the force structure implications of intervening in internal conflicts within our region and beyond. It is true that some of the

deficiencies identified after East Timor are now being addressed. \$3.9 billion of new capabilities are being allocated to the land force over the course of this decade and the 2000 White Paper belatedly acknowledges that the maritime strategy includes “a vital and central role for the land forces.”⁴⁸ But there has been no serious attempt to flesh out this new role or articulate in convincing fashion how the ADF’s repeated overseas deployments are consistent with a defensive maritime strategy.⁴⁹ And there is little sign of a willingness to make changes to a force structure that is still heavily reliant on expensive sea and air assets that cannot be easily adapted to contingencies other than DOA, despite claims to the contrary.

Core tasks - what should the ADF do?

A third problem is the inability of DOA to accommodate the plethora of new human security, border protection and constabulary tasks that have been levied on the ADF in recent years. Defence Minister Robert Hill’s list is instructive. “We have peace-keepers and monitors in East Timor and Bougainville. We have ground, air and naval forces in Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf engaged in coalition operations against terrorism. Our warships are involved in surveillance and protection of Australia’s borders, intercepting boats carrying would-be illegal entrants in our northern waters and illegal fishing vessels in the storm-tossed Southern Ocean.”⁵⁰ Hill’s list is far from exhaustive. Other ADF tasks include Service Assisted Evacuation (SAE), Service Protected Evacuation (SPE), Special Recovery Operations (SRO), assistance in domestic crisis situations, international disaster relief and enforcement of international law as well as arms control and support of Australia’s humanitarian obligations. In aggregate, these new duties, none of which fit easily within the DOA mind set, now account for the majority of the ADF’s operational tasks.⁵¹

Hill’s comments raise the obvious question of how much further the DOA strategy can be stretched to reconcile this diverse agenda before it completely loses conceptual shape under the stresses of its internal contradictions. Defenders of the status quo continue to aver that a force designed to defend Australia and organised for conventional war-fighting can adapt to the demands of the new agenda, including peace-keeping and military operations other than war (MOOTW).⁵² Furthermore, there is a marked reluctance to accept that transnational threats to security - often misleadingly referred to as ‘soft’ security issues - have any relevance for the ADF’s structure, doctrine or training. Traditionalists tend to pose this dichotomy as a stark choice between structuring for ‘high end capabilities’ or the new security challenges implying that the ADF cannot do both without fatal compromises which would result in an ADF less able to prosecute

conventional war and meet the new security challenges.⁵³ Reconfiguring the ADF for transnational threats, in their view, would effectively “downgrade” the Force, shift the regional balance and weaken Australia’s security.⁵⁴

Such thinking reveals a worrying inability to comprehend the way in which defence forces are being transformed by the new strategic agenda and underlines a fourth problem - a reluctance to recognise that transnational threats have moved along the threat continuum towards the traditional concerns of the ADF. Elsewhere in the world, Cold War notions of war fighting and winning military victories are giving way to a more sophisticated appreciation of what Basil Liddell Hart, the pre-eminent strategist of his era, has called the “art of distributing and applying military means to fulfil the ends of policy.”⁵⁵ The central purpose of the military in the 21st century is not merely the application of lethal force. This is old thinking. Modern defence forces have to win the peace as well as prepare for war. The two are not the same. Winning the peace means that military personnel at all levels must be able to master the cultural, economic and political dimensions of a conflict and be discriminating in their use of lethal force.⁵⁶

Peace-keeping is a pertinent example. In 2001, there were some 51 multinational peace operations conducted around the globe and the ADF was involved in many of them.⁵⁷ Indeed, complex peace operations encompassing peace-keeping, peace-enforcement and peace-building are now, by any objective measure, a major ADF activity.⁵⁸ Yet the architects of strategic policy doggedly refuse to accept that complex peace operations are a core task for the ADF or that they should shape, in any way, the capabilities of the force. Thus, while the 2000 White Paper notes the requirement to participate in peace-keeping and peace-enforcement missions, it is careful to add the caveat that such roles ought “not to detract from the ADF’s core function of defending Australia from armed attack”. ‘Structured for war but adapted for peace’ is the often heard refrain from those who regard peace-keeping as a derivative or secondary task.⁵⁹

Traditionalists fear that shaping the military for peace operations will dull the sword and reduce the ADF’s war fighting capabilities.⁶⁰ Similar attitudes permeate the US armed forces which, like the ADF, has historically privileged the warrior ethos. One senior US military officer was once famously heard to remark, “Real men don’t do MOOTW [military operations other than war].”⁶¹ Unfortunately, these sentiments betray a fundamental misappreciation of the place and importance of complex peace operations in conflict prevention and post-war reconstruction and nation building.

Peace operations are an integral part of a modern defence forces repertoire of core competencies enhancing, rather than degrading, war-fighting skills and capabilities since they are intrinsic to the task. This was a key finding of an eminent panel of 22 senior US military leaders which numbered among them Generals Colin Powell, Norman Schwarzkopf and seven other four star commanders, who unanimously rejected the criticism that peace operations dangerously compromise war-fighting capability.⁶²

So the choice is not between structuring for war or peace-keeping, as traditionalists falsely assume. The defence forces of the 21st century must be structured for both, but they cannot be effective peace keepers and peace enforcers if they do not specifically train for these tasks or possess the appropriate support and equipment. Similarly, if governments decide to use the ADF for non-military tasks such as operations against people smugglers, drug traffickers and illegal fishing vessels on a regular and continuing basis, then at some point changes to force structure and training will become inevitable. Ad hoc responses lead to sub-optimal performance and operational over-stretch, endangering lives and jeopardising mission objectives.

What others are doing

The inertia and complacency of much of what passes for strategic thinking in this country is strikingly evident when compared with our traditional benchmark countries, the UK, Canada and the US.⁶³ Recent British strategic reviews and white papers unequivocally accept the need for transformation and changes to force structure. The watershed 1998 Defence Review, the most important for 30 years, articulated a post-Cold War middle power strategy based on a leaner, more mobile force specifically equipped and trained for distant operations, including peace-keeping. As described by the then Defence Secretary, George Robertson, British forces must be prepared “to go to the crisis rather than have the crisis come to us.”⁶⁴ The UK has also identified a need for rapidly deployable reaction forces, in part to deal with terrorists and other emerging threats that “attack our way of life”, which may need to be despatched further afield and more frequently than had previously been envisaged.⁶⁵

Canada has responded in a similar fashion to the UK. Driven by mission creep, a historically high tempo of operations and the demands of deploying 4,000 Canadians on a variety of complex, international operations, Ottawa is moving towards a more adaptable, multi-purpose force that can respond quickly to crises at home and abroad. The Canadian military is working to develop “globally deployable combat capable forces” that can operate

effectively in multi-national coalitions.⁶⁶ Canadian defence planning emphasises the protection and promotion of national interests and values rather than direct threats to the country's well being and sovereignty. There is explicit recognition of the need for changes to the status quo in light of the dramatically altered strategic landscape, as well as a refreshing willingness to acknowledge the deficiencies of earlier white papers in not anticipating the higher tempo of operations and force projection requirements.⁶⁷

Even the US military has begun to recognise that while the great majority of its resources are still devoted to fighting against a symmetrical foe, it is increasingly unlikely that any adversary will seek to challenge the US with symmetrical force.⁶⁸ This is a seminal change in thinking that has direct implications for the ADF. Those who doubt the cathartic effect of 11 September on the US defence establishment would do well to read a briefing given to the Washington press corps by US Secretary of Defence, Donald Rumsfeld, in June 2002. Rumsfeld made it abundantly clear that the war against terrorism is forcing the US to make substantial adjustments to its budget, organisation, acquisition programs and strategy. The US defence establishment, he said, was organised, trained and equipped to fight armies, navies and air forces but the problem is that global terrorist networks do not have armies, navies and air forces. "It's a totally different ball game."⁶⁹

If the future is coalition operations with the US against asymmetrical foes in defence of regional and global order, then the lesson for Australia is that we need to acquire capabilities that are suited to this undertaking. Australian traditionalists are highly selective in the way they benchmark against the US military, extolling the virtues of interoperability at the high end of the conflict spectrum rather than looking at ways in which Australia can complement US military strengths in low intensity conflicts and peace operations.⁷⁰ Of course, there is no immutable strategic logic which dictates that Australia must automatically follow the British, Canadian and American lead. To do so blindly would be folly and an abrogation of our responsibility to shape a force structured for Australia's strategic environment and circumstances.

Equally, however, it would be a mistake to regard Australia's security challenges as somehow unique or markedly different from those of our friends and allies. In fact, the probability of the ADF being deployed on complex peace-keeping, nation-building and low intensity warfare tasks is arguably greater because we live in a part of the world where failed states, weak states and hostile non-state actors are an integral part of the strategic landscape. Virtually all Western defence forces have accepted the reality that they must become smaller, multi-skilled, less platform oriented and

able to deploy highly capable forces, quickly over long distances, sometimes to the far corners of the globe. Yet while others transform for the conflicts of the future we, for the most part, remain wedded to strategic concepts that have long past their use by date.

Transforming the ADF

The key lesson to be drawn from this analysis is that the ADF is not optimally configured or trained for today's conflicts, let alone for those of tomorrow. It is axiomatic that the ADF should be able to defend Australia against military attack. But DOA is too narrowly conceived and disconnected from the security challenges of the contemporary world to provide the necessary strategic guidance for an ADF in urgent need of transformation. No amount of 'adaptation' or creative language in official documents can disguise this failing. What is required is a defence strategy and posture that conceives war as more than just a state activity waged for clearly defined political, territorial or ideological purposes. As Mary Kaldor has written, the new wars are about identity politics rather than classical geo-politics. The contest is increasingly between those who support cosmopolitan, inclusive societies based on tolerance and freedom of expression, and those who favour particularist and exclusive identities characteristic of closed societies.⁷¹ Furthermore, transnational threats are arising that cannot be defeated by force of arms and cannot be located at a particular place or point in time.

It would be a mistake to characterise this call for strategic renewal as merely the latest incarnation of the long-standing debate between proponents of forward defence and continental defence. These tired old shibboleths reflect the linear thinking of a bygone era and shed little light on the essential defence and security problems for Australia in the 21st century. Deploying force beyond our immediate neighbourhood is perfectly consistent with the defence of Australia's vital interests and should not be construed as fighting someone else's war or developing a costly, expeditionary force. In an interconnected world the ADF cannot be designed to defend a fictional moat by pulling up the drawbridge of fortress Australia when a threat suddenly materialises, for modern war is waged on a global battlefield and our enemies may already be within the castle keep. Nor can we afford the luxury of building a superstructure to withstand the once in a hundred year flood - a major military attack - as DOA advocates imply. Other, more effective mitigation strategies are available and the opportunity costs are simply too high given that the ADF is confronted by a multiplicity of here and now problems that are not being adequately addressed.

Transformation should not be seen as a prescription for radical change. There is much that we are doing right and a legacy force cannot be reconfigured overnight. It is worth recalling that the Blitzkrieg unleashed on Europe in 1939 to such devastating effect was accomplished by only a 13 percent transformed German Army. Transformation does not necessarily mean acquiring new capabilities. It can be achieved by “new ways of arranging, connecting, and using existing capabilities.”⁷² Nor does it mandate increased defence spending. Significant transformation can be achieved through a modest reordering of priorities and adjustments to existing programs. Since future conflicts will still require some high-end capabilities, Australia must retain a robust capacity for conventional war fighting whether in our own region or further afield. However, we have been slow to recognise that the ADF must also be capable of combating the irregular, low intensity conflicts that now predominate and to counter post-modern, hybrid threats which require a different repertoire of military skills to those of the Cold War.

A force designed for state-on-state conflict will struggle to manage the multifarious security challenges posed by neo-nationalist guerrilla movements, terrorists, new age mercenaries, pirates, people smugglers and global crime syndicates. The rhetorical acknowledgment of this wider strategic agenda in our white papers is superficial, lacks conviction and is belied by an obvious reluctance to consider changes to the ADF’s capabilities and training.⁷³ Too often, the architects of strategic policy seem to regard force structure as written in stone, inviolable and sacrosanct. But such inflexibility is the antithesis of good strategy which results from measuring risk against probability and cost to determine capability.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to articulate a detailed force structure for the ADF which is properly the duty and prerogative of government. But its essential features can be charted. First, the ADF must possess a greater capacity for strategic reach and off-shore deployments beyond the confines of our immediate neighbourhood in support of Australia’s wider security interests.⁷⁴ This includes defence of a stable, international system underpinned by what French President, Jacques Chirac, has characterised as “a few principles and a little order.”⁷⁵ Forces earmarked for this role do not have to be large or necessarily able to operate independently, as they will almost certainly work in coalition with others, especially the US. Since the ‘core martial competency’ of the US military is global power projection, Washington should be asked to provide the heavy lift, superior battlefield knowledge and lethal firepower for more distant operations.⁷⁶ For its part, the ADF needs to acquire more high-value, niche capabilities and additional

land forces equipped for a wide range of contingencies across the threat spectrum that can be despatched rapidly, with adequate force protection, sustainment and command and control.

Second, the ADF must be trained and configured for multi-faceted tasks, not just the defence of Australia from conventional military attack. Complex peace operations, counter terrorism, defence against WMD and designated non-military threats should be treated as core missions, not dismissed as secondary or lower order responsibilities. Hybrid threats encompass a wide spectrum of risks, so the ADF needs to be a far more agile, flexible, mobile, multi-skilled and innovative organisation than in the past. Cultural change is imperative along with a recognition that traditional war-fighting is only one part of the conflict spectrum to be mastered; that peace operations are often far from peaceful; and the ADF must prepare its personnel to be humanitarians and peace keepers as well as warriors.⁷⁷ Greater emphasis should be given to littoral operations, urban warfare and countering asymmetric threats, especially from the plethora of non-state actors who are crowding onto the international security agenda.⁷⁸

Third, while technological superiority is essential to the knowledge edge, it must be usable and appropriate, for the new wars as well as the old. Unfortunately, some of our existing systems fail this crucial test. Too much of the defence budget and our national treasure are spent on capabilities that lack versatility or are prohibitively expensive to maintain and run. The future is lower cost, modular, multi-purpose platforms equipped with miniaturised missiles and drones, lethal microbots and 'dial-a-yield' munitions supported by integrated C4ISR and real time sensor to shooter architecture.⁷⁹ In the meantime, however, we have to manage the transition from the legacy force to one better structured for a world in which there may be no clear-cut distinction between soldiers and civilians and between organised violence, terror, crime and war. This is the real challenge for our defence planners and it is one they cannot afford to fail.

Notes

- 1 A revised version of this paper appeared as 'Transformation or Stagnation? Rethinking Australia's Defence' in the *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, vol.57, no.1, April 2003, pp.55-76.
- 2 For a comprehensive evaluation of the transnational challenge to regional security see Alan Dupont, *East Asia Imperilled: Transnational Challenges to Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- 3 Paul Dibb, *Review of Australia's Defence Capabilities*, Report to the Minister for Defence March 1986, Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service, 1986. The Review was commissioned by the Labor Defence Minister of that era, Kim Beazley.
- 4 Dibb, *Review of Australia's Defence Capabilities*, p.51.
- 5 Deborah Snow, 'We're perilously unready for war: ex-SAS boss', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 September 2002, p.1 and 'Limping as to war', *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 25 September 2002, p.15.
- 6 Senator the Hon. Robert Hill, Minister for Defence, *Beyond the White Paper: Strategic Directions for Defence*, Address to the Australian Defence College, Canberra, 18 June 2002, pp.1-6.
- 7 *Ibid.*
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 *Ibid.*
- 10 Senator the Hon. Robert Hill, 'S11: Its Implications for Australia and the Defence White Paper', *Defender*, Winter 2002, p.10.
- 11 Brian Toohey, 'Hill's thinking goes out of bounds', *Australian Financial Review*, 22-23 June 2002, p.51; Robert Garran, 'Defence outlook 'uncertain'', *The Australian*, 24 September 1998, p.2.
- 12 The 'inner arc' refers to Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and the small Pacific islands that encircle Australia to the northeast. The term made its first official appearance in the 1997 Strategic Review.
- 13 In 1904, Halford Mackinder delivered a seminal paper to the Royal Geographic Society in London arguing that European civilisation had been shaped by the struggle to repel a succession of Asiatic invasions. His conceptualisation of a pivot area, comprising central Asia, adjacent to an "inner crescent" of nations accessible by sea power privileged geography as the determining factor in world politics. But, like other geographical determinists, he neglected to make allowances for technological advances and the power of ideology. Osama bin Laden needs no introduction.
- 14 They include the Persian Gulf, Somalia, Cambodia, Afghanistan and Kyrgyzstan to name a few.
- 15 A phrase that appears in the 2000 White Paper along with the equally contestable statement that "the benefits of our strategic geography are immutable." *Defence 2000: Our Future Defence Force*, Canberra: Defence Publishing Service, October 2000, p.23.
- 16 Paul Mann, 'Fathoming A Strategic World Of 'No Bear, But Many Snakes'', *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, 6 December 1999, p.63.
- 17 The classic exposition of sea power is Alfred Thayer Mahan, *The Influence of Sea Power upon History 1660-1783*, Boston: Dover Publications, 1890.

- 18 As Michael Evans has noted in several of his works. See, for example, Michael Evans, 'From Deakin to Dibb: The Army and the Making of Australian Strategy in the 20th Century', *Working Paper No. 113*, Land Studies Warfare Centre, Duntroon, Canberra, June 2001, p.30.
- 19 In the wake of the coup, the ADF had considerable difficulty in assembling and deploying a task force to Fiji. Yet the weaknesses in helicopter and logistics capabilities identified at the time had still not been fully addressed a decade later. See Matthew Gubb, 'The Australian Military Response to the Fiji Coup: An Assessment', *Working Paper No.171*, Strategic and Defence Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, November 1988.
- 20 On this point see Army Chief, Lieutenant General Peter Leahy, 'Future Wars-Futuristic Forces, *Speech to the Land Warfare Conference*, Brisbane, 23 October 2002, particularly his criticisms of the 'gatekeepers of strategic doctrine'. Former Land Forces Commander, Major General John Hartley, calculated that 20 of the 22 operations involving the ADF during the 1990s were overwhelming conducted by land forces. John, Hartley, 'A Review of the White Paper', *Asia-Pacific Defence Reporter*, February 2001, p.29.
- 21 Thus, Paul Dibb asserts that "even if the risk of any armed attack on Australia is low, the consequences of misjudging it would be serious." Paul Dibb, 'Tinker with defence policy and risk attack', *The Australian*, 30 October 2001, p.13. In similar vein, Hugh White avers that we should "eschew the superficial plausibility of the idea that we should give highest priority to the most probable outcomes." Hugh White, 'Australian defence policy and the possibility of war', *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 56 (2), July 2002, p.259.
- 22 In 1942, the General Staff of the Japanese Imperial Army estimated that it would require 12 fully equipped infantry divisions and 1.5 million tons of shipping for the Army alone to invade Australia which was assessed as a "reckless adventure" and "beyond Japan's capability." Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence, *Threats to Australia's Security: Their Nature and Probability* Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1981, Annex C, p.62.
- 23 See, for example, *Defence 2000: Our Future Defence Force*, Canberra: Defence Publishing Service, October 2000, pp.23-24 and *Australia's Strategic Policy*, Canberra: Department of Defence, December 1997, p.31. Contrast this view with the Bush Administration's National Security Strategy, which regards WMD in the hands of terrorists and rogue states as the major threat to US and international security. *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, The White House, 17 September 2002, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>.
- 24 The closest approximation in the Indonesian Army to our regular Army are the two divisions plus of the Strategic Reserve (KOSTRAD). Along with the Special Forces (KOPASSUS), they are the only troops in the Indonesian Armed Forces (TNI) trained for modern warfare. However, KOSTRAD has virtually no organic logistic capability which severely restricts its capability to deploy overseas. For an excellent analysis of the structure and functions of TNI see Bob Lowry, *The Armed Forces of Indonesia* St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin, 1996, especially pp.85-115.

- 25 Derwin Pereira, 'Indonesian navy ships not fit to fight, says chief', *The Straits Times*, 3 July 2002, <http://www.straitstimes.asia1.com.sg>.
- 26 'Indonesia's air force chief say planes, radar system not fully working', *Agence France Presse*, 4 July 2002.
- 27 For a sober analysis of China's power projection capabilities see Lieutenant Colonel Rick Reese, 'On the Myth of Chinese Power Projection Capabilities', *Breakthroughs*, Spring 1998, VIII (1), especially pp.24-25. It is also worth noting that PLA doctrine and tactics is still primarily orientated towards fighting land battles on China's soil or adjacent territory, and developing capabilities for isolating and conquering Taiwan. David Shambaugh, 'China's Military Views the World', *International Security*, 24 (3), Winter 1999/2000, p.58.
- 28 General Anthony C. Zinni, 'A Military for the 21st Century: Lessons from the Recent Past', *Strategic Forum* no.181, July 2001, p.1.
- 29 Martin Van Creveld, *The Transformation of War*, New York: The Free Press, 1991, pp.16-32.
- 30 Karl von Clausewitz (1780-1831) is widely considered to be the first modern strategist and one of the leading exponents of the view that war is rational, national and instrumental. He is best known for his dictum that "war is nothing more than the continuation of politics by other means." Ken Booth, 'The Evolution of Strategic Thinking' in John Baylis, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams, *Contemporary Strategy: Theories and Policies* New York: Holmes & Meier, 1975, pp.23-25.
- 31 Michael E. Brown (ed.), *The International Dimensions of Internal Conflict* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1996, p. 1.
- 32 On this point see Jan Aart Scholte, *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*, London: Palgrave, 2000, p.33.
- 33 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2002: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, Chapter 1, <http://editors.sipri.se/pubs/yb02/ch01.html>.
- 34 Not only have interstate wars become relatively rare but internal conflicts have on the whole been much bloodier, featuring great 'collateral damage' to civilian populations caught up in the fighting or its immediate aftermath. Nearly 90 per cent of war-related casualties during the 1990s were civilian: Indra de Soysa and Nils Petter Gleditsch, *To Cultivate Peace: Agriculture in a World of Conflict*, PRIO Report 1/99 International Peace Research Institute, Oslo, 1999, pp. 7, 13-15.
- 35 Dupont, *East Asia Imperilled: Transnational Challenges to Security*, Cambridge, p.178.
- 36 Anthony Davis, 'Thailand tackles border security', *Jane's Intelligence Review* March 2000, p. 31.
- 37 *Ibid*, pp. 30-1; Stefan Leader and David Wiencek, 'Drug money: the fuel for global terrorism', *Jane's Intelligence Review* February 2000, p. 53.
- 38 Christian Reus-Smit, 'Lost at Sea: Australia in the Turbulence of World Politics', *Working Paper 2002/4*, July 2002, Department of International Relations, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University, Canberra,

- p.17. Terrorists can be located within the broader phenomenon of groups who through violence and political organisation seek the dissolution of states, regime change or broader systemic 'renewal'.
- 39 Jemaah Islamiyah's links with al Qa'ida, and its home grown roots, notably through the 'Ngruki Network' in Indonesia (named after a religious school in Central Java), are well documented in ICG Asia Briefing, *Al-Qaeda in Southeast Asia: The Case of the "Ngruki Network" in Indonesia*, Jakarta, 8 August 2002.
- 40 Neil Livingstone, Chief of Global Options, an international crisis company quoted in Paul Mann, 'Modern Military Threats: Not All They Might Seem?' *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, 22 April 2002, p.56.
- 41 The research conducted by the RAND Corporation's Arroyo Center is a case in point. See the study by RAND's Arroyo Urban Operations team, 'Tomorrow's Warfare: Urban Operations in the 21st Century', 22 August 2002, http://www.rand.org/natsec_area/products/urbanops.html and associated research.
- 42 Dupont, *East Asia Imperilled: Transnational Challenges to Security*, p.39, 41.
- 43 In an abortive US special forces mission to capture Aidid and his senior leadership, 18 Americans lost their lives and 84 were wounded. Somali dead numbered 312 with 814 wounded, a kill ratio which would normally be considered a crushing victory. Brian Adams, *The Next World War: The Warriors And Weapons Of The New Battlefields In Cyberspace*, London: Hutchinson, Random House, 1998, pp.71-72.
- 44 General Charles C. Krulak, 'The United States Marine Corps in the 21st Century', *RUSI Journal*, CXXXI, ii, August 1996, p.25. Desert Storm was the US led operation that evicted Saddam Hussein's army from Kuwait.
- 45 General Charles C. Krulak, *Warfighting Concepts for the 21st Century*, Concepts Division, Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia, 1996, p. VII-6.
- 46 Given its comparable size and tasks, the ADF is best compared with the US Marine Corps rather than the much larger and globally oriented US Army, Navy and Air Force.
- 47 This analysis is based on interviews of ADF officers with direct knowledge of Army deficiencies prior to and during the Interfet deployment to East Timor.
- 48 *Defence 2000: Our Future Defence Force*, p.47.
- 49 While the 2000 White Paper talks about a maritime strategy, it provides little insight into how such a strategy would work in practice. See Commander David Stephens, *AUS-CSCAP Newsletter*, 13, May 2002, p.41.
- 50 Minister for Defence, Senator Robert Hill, *Beyond the White Paper: Strategic Directions for Defence*, Address to the Australian Defence College, Canberra, 18 June 2002.
- 51 In SAE, the ADF would contribute specialists like air traffic controllers and military police to an essentially civilian operation, whereas in SPEs the ADF would provide the bulk of the resources. SROs would normally be carried out by special forces. The best treatment of the ADF's new human security, border protection and constabulary tasks is Ian Wing, *Australian Defence In Transition: Responding To New Security Challenges*, Canberra: Australian Defence Force

- Academy, Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2002, pp.209-284. See also Desmond Ball, 'Australian Defence Planning: Problems and Prospects', *Pacifica Review*, 12 (3), October 2000, pp.291-292.
- 52 Paul Dibb, for one, believes the ADF has "demonstrated that forces structured for the defence of Australia and its approaches can meet all the tasks asked of it by the government". Dibb, 'Tinker with defence policy and risk attack', p.13.
- 53 White, 'Australian defence policy and the possibility of war', p. 256.
- 54 Dibb, 'Tinker with defence policy and risk attack', p.13 and Ian Bostock, 'Australia defines its future', *Jane's Defence Weekly*, 10 January 2001, p.22.
- 55 B. H. Liddell Hart, *Deterrent or Defence*, London: Stevens, 1960, p.66.
- 56 General John J. Sheehan, US Marine Corps quoted in Brigadier General B.B. Bingham, Colonel D.L. Rubini and Colonel M.J. Cleary, 'US Army Civil Affairs Ministerial Advisory Teams Deploy to Haiti', *Military Review*, September-October 2001, p.63. This implies cultural change as argued by Nick Jans and David Schmidchen, in *The Real C-cubed, Culture, Careers and Climate and how they affect capability*, Canberra Papers on Strategy and Defence no.143, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University, Canberra, 2002.
- 57 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2002: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, <http://editors.sipri.se/pubs/yb02/ch01.html>.
- 58 Complex peace operations is a term that denotes any combination of peace-keeping, peace-enforcement or peace-building activities aimed at preventing or minimising conflict and promoting stability, especially in weak or failed states. It refers to operations governed by Chapters VI (pacific), VII (using all necessary means) and VIII (regional arrangements) of the United Nation's Charter.
- 59 *Defence 2000: Our Future Defence Force*, p.13.
- 60 When Canada controversially amalgamated the three single services and began to focus on peace-keeping, Australian critics were quick to dismiss the Canadian Forces (CF) as a viable combat force and warned of the fate that would befall the ADF should it attempt to emulate the CF.
- 61 Quoted in General Anthony C. Zinni (former US Marine Corps Commander), 'A Military for the 21st Century: Lessons from the Recent Past', *Strategic Forum* no.181, July 2001, p.2.
- 62 *Force for Peace: US Commanders' Views of the Military's Role in Peace Operations*, Peace Through Law Education Fund, Washington DC, June 1999, p.8, cited in Wing, *Australian Defence In Transition: Responding To New Security Challenges*, p.158. The signatories included Generals Powell, Schwarzkopf, Vuono, Zinni and Admiral Prueher, a former Commander in Chief of US Forces in the Pacific.
- 63 US and UK defence planners seem far more amenable to using and encouraging cutting edge strategic research, including that produced by civilian and military think tanks.
- 64 Warren Hoge, 'Britain Plans Defense Cuts and Military Reform', *International Herald Tribune*, 9 July 1998, <http://www.iht.com>.

- 65 UK Ministry of Defence, *The Strategic Defence Review: A New Chapter*, July 2002, <http://www.mod.uk/issues/sdr/newchapter/intro.htm>.
- 66 Canadian Department of Defence, *Shaping the Future of the Canadian Forces: A Strategy for 2020*, June 1999 (also referred to as Defence Strategy 2020).
- 67 Canadian Department of Defence, *Defence Planning Guidance 2001 (DPG 2001)*, 11 April 2000.
- 68 The exceptions might be China in the Taiwan Straits or a desperate North Korean regime in a last throw of the strategic dice. But such conflicts would be local, rather than global, and neither China nor North Korea could hope to prevail in a direct military confrontation with the US.
- 69 US Department of Defense News Transcript of briefing by Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld and the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Myers, 17 June 2002, <http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jun2002/t0617200>.
- 70 Ron Huisken, 'QDR 2001: America's New Military Roadmap: Implications for Asia and Australia', *Working Paper No. 366*, Strategic and Defence Studies Centre, Australian National University, Canberra, March 2002, p.20.
- 71 Mary Kaldor, *New & Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1999, pp.6-7.
- 72 US Secretary of State, Donald Rumsfeld, quoted in General Richard E. Hawley and John R. Backschie, 'Closing The Global Strike Gap', *Armed Forces Journal International*, September 2001, p.40.
- 73 Unlike in the US where multiple studies have been commissioned to ascertain where changes are needed. See, for example, Daniel Smith, Marcus Corbin and Christopher Hellman, 'Reforging the Sword: Forces for a 21st Century Security Strategy', Center for Defense Information, September 2001, <http://www.cdi.org>.
- 74 On this point see Michael Evans, *Conventional Deterrence in the Australian Strategic Context*, Working Paper No.103, Land Warfare Studies Centre, Canberra, May 1999, p.2.
- 75 See also Admiral C.A. Barrie, Chief of the Defence Force, 'Change, People and Australia's Defence Capability for the New Century', *Australian Defence Force Journal*, 134, January/February 1999, p.5.
- 76 Michael P. Noonan and John Hillen, 'The Coming Transformation of the US Military? E-Notes, Foreign Policy Research Institute, 4 February 2002.
- 77 Wing, *Australian Defence In Transition: Responding To New Security Challenges*, p.395. For an illuminating insight into the role of defence forces in peace operations see the UK Strategic Defence Review, July 1998, <http://www.mod.uk/issues/sdr/index.htm>.
- 78 It is revealing that of the 250 operations conducted by the US Marine Corps in the first decade of the post Cold War world, 237 were in urban environments. Mann, 'Modern Military Threats: Not All They Might Seem?', p.57.
- 79 *Ibid*. C4ISR refers to command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities.

SDSC Publications

Canberra Papers on Strategy and Defence

CP43	<i>Australia's Secret Space Programs</i> by Desmond Ball	15.00
CP44	<i>High Personnel Turnover: The ADF Is Not a Limited Liability Company</i> by Cathy Downes	15.00
CP45	<i>Should Australia Plan to Defend Christmas and Cocos Islands?</i> by Ross Babbage	15.00
CP46	<i>US Bases in the Philippines: Issues and Implications</i> by Desmond Ball (ed)	15.00
CP47	<i>Soviet Signals Intelligence (SIGINT)</i> by Desmond Ball	20.00
CP48	<i>The Vietnam People's Army: Regularization of Command 1975-1988</i> by D.M. FitzGerald	15.00
CP49	<i>Australia and the Global Strategic Balance</i> by Desmond Ball	15.00
CP50	<i>Organising an Army: the Australian Experience 1957-1965</i> by J.C. Blaxland	20.00
CP51	<i>The Evolving World Economy: Some Alternative Security Questions for Australia</i> by Richard A. Higgott	15.00
CP52	<i>Defending the Northern Gateway</i> by Peter Donova	15.00
CP53	<i>Soviet Signals Intelligence (SIGINT): Intercepting Satellite Communications</i> by Desmond Ball	20.00
CP54	<i>Breaking the American Alliance: An Independent National Security Policy for Australia</i> by Gary Brown	20.00
CP55	<i>Senior Officer Professional Development in the Australian Defence Force: Constant Study to Prepare</i> by Cathy Downes	20.00
CP56	<i>Code 777: Australia and the US Defense Satellite Communications System (DSCS)</i> by Desmond Ball	22.50
CP57	<i>China's Crisis: The International Implications</i> by Gary Klintworth (ed)	17.00
CP58	<i>Index to Parliamentary Questions on Defence</i> by Gary Brown	20.00
CP59	<i>Controlling Civil Maritime Activities in a Defence Contingency</i> by W.A.G. Dovers	17.00
CP60	<i>The Security of Oceania in the 1990s. Vol.I, Views from the Region</i> by David Hegarty and Peter Polomka (eds)	15.00
CP61	<i>The Strategic Significance of Torres Strait</i> by Ross Babbage	30.00
CP62	<i>The Leading Edge: Air Power in Australia's Unique Environment</i> by P.J. Criss and D.J. Schubert	22.50
CP63	<i>The Northern Territory in the Defence of Australia: Geography, History, Economy, Infrastructure, and Defence Presence</i> by Desmond Ball and J.O. Langtry (eds)	24.50
CP64	<i>Vietnam's Withdrawal from Cambodia: Regional Issues and Realignments</i> by Gary Klintworth (ed)	17.00
CP65	<i>Prospects for Crisis Prediction: A South Pacific Case Study</i> by Ken Ross	20.00
CP66	<i>Bougainville: Perspectives on a Crisis</i> by Peter Polomka (ed)	20.00
CP67	<i>The Amateur Managers: A Study of the Management of Weapons System Projects</i> by F.N. Bennett	22.50
CP68	<i>The Security of Oceania in the 1990s. Vol.2, Managing Change</i> by Peter Polomka (ed)	15.00

CP69	<i>Australia and the World: Prologue and Prospects</i> by Desmond Ball (ed)	25.00
CP70	<i>Singapore's Defence Industries</i> by Bilveer Singh	14.00
CP71	<i>RAAF Air Power Doctrine: A Collection of Contemporary Essays</i> by Gary Waters (ed)	15.00
CP72	<i>South Pacific Security: Issues and Perspectives</i> by Stephen Henningham and Desmond Ball (eds)	20.00
CP73	<i>The Northern Territory in the Defence of Australia: Strategic and Operational Considerations</i> by J.O. Langtry and Desmond Ball (eds)	24.50
CP74	<i>The Architect of Victory: Air Campaigns for Australia</i> by Gary Waters	23.00
CP75	<i>Modern Taiwan in the 1990s</i> by Gary Klintworth (ed)	23.00
CP76	<i>New Technology: Implications for Regional and Australian Security</i> by Desmond Ball and Helen Wilson (eds)	23.00
CP77	<i>Reshaping the Australian Army: Challenges for the 1990s</i> by David Horner (ed.)	24.00
CP78	<i>The Intelligence War in the Gulf</i> by Desmond Ball	17.50
CP79	<i>Provocative Plans: A Critique of US Strategy for Maritime Conflict in the North Pacific</i> by Desmond Ball	20.00
CP80	<i>Soviet SIGINT: Hawaii Operation</i> by Desmond Ball	17.50
CP81	<i>Chasing Gravity's Rainbow: Kwajalein and US Ballistic Missile Testing</i> by Owen Wilkes, Megan van Frank and Peter Hayes	22.50
CP82	<i>Australia's Threat Perceptions: A Search for Security</i> by Alan Dupont	17.00
CP83	<i>Building Blocks for Regional Security: An Australian Perspective on Confidence and Security Building Measures (CSBMs) in the Asia/Pacific Region</i> by Desmond Ball	17.00
CP84	<i>Australia's Security Interests in Northeast Asia</i> by Alan Dupont	18.50
CP85	<i>Finance and Financial Policy in Defence Contingencies</i> by Paul Lee	17.00
CP86	<i>Mine Warfare in Australia's First Line of Defence</i> by Alan Hinge	23.00
CP87	<i>Hong Kong's Future as a Regional Transport Hub</i> by Peter J. Rimmer	20.00
CP88	<i>The Conceptual Basis of Australia's Defence Planning and Force Structure Development</i> by Paul Dibb	17.50
CP89	<i>Strategic Studies in a Changing World: Global, Regional and Australian Perspectives</i> by Desmond Ball and David Horner (eds)	28.00
CP90	<i>The Gulf War: Australia's Role and Asian-Pacific Responses</i> by J. Mohan Malik	21.00
CP91	<i>Defence Aspects of Australia's Space Activities</i> by Desmond Ball	20.00
CP92	<i>The Five Power Defence Arrangements and Military Cooperation among the ASEAN States: Incompatible Models for Security in Southeast Asia?</i> by Philip Methven	23.00
CP93	<i>Infrastructure and Security: Problems of Development in the West Sepik Province of Papua New Guinea</i> by T.M. Boyce	23.00
CP94	<i>Australia and Space</i> by Desmond Ball and Helen Wilson (eds)	26.00
CP95	<i>LANDFORCE: 2010: Some Implications of Technology for ADF Future Land Force Doctrine, Leadership and Structures</i> by David W. Beveridge	15.50

CP96	<i>The Origins of Australian Diplomatic Intelligence in Asia, 1933-1941</i> by Wayne Gobert	17.50
CP97	<i>Japan as Peacekeeper: Samurai State, or New Civilian Power?</i> by Peter Polomka	16.00
CP98	<i>The Post-Soviet World: Geopolitics and Crises</i> by Coral Bell	15.00
CP99	<i>Indonesian Defence Policy and the Indonesian Armed Forces</i> by Bob Lowry	20.00
CP100	<i>Regional Security in the South Pacific: The Quarter-Century 1970-95</i> by Ken Ross	23.00
CP101	<i>The Changing Role of the Military in Papua New Guinea</i> by R.J. May	15.00
CP102	<i>Strategic Change and Naval Forces: Issues for a Medium Level Naval Power</i> by Sam Bateman and Dick Sherwood (eds)	23.00
CP103	<i>ASEAN Defence Reorientation 1975-1992: The Dynamics of Modernisation and Structural Change</i> by J.N. Mak	24.00
CP104	<i>The United Nations and Crisis Management: Six Studies</i> by Coral Bell (ed)	17.50
CP105	<i>Operational and Technological Developments in Maritime Warfare: Implications for the Western Pacific</i> by Dick Sherwood (ed)	20.00
CP106	<i>More Than Little Heroes: Australian Army Air Liaison Officers in the Second World War</i> by Nicola Baker	23.00
CP107	<i>Vanuatu's 1980 Santo Rebellion: International Responses to a Microstate Security Crisis</i> by Matthew Gubb	14.00
CP108	<i>The Development of Australian Army Doctrine 1945-1964</i> by M.C.J. Welburn	15.00
CP109	<i>The Navy and National Security: The Peacetime Dimension</i> by Dick Sherwood	16.00
CP110	<i>Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) in South Korea</i> by Desmond Ball	15.00
CP111	<i>India Looks East: An Emerging Power and Its Asia-Pacific Neighbours</i> by Sandy Gordon and Stephen Henningham (eds)	24.00
CP112	<i>Nation, Region and Context: Studies in Peace and War in Honour of Professor T.B. Millar</i> by Coral Bell (ed.)	24.00
CP113	<i>Transforming the Tatmadaw: The Burmese Armed Forces since 1988</i> by Andrew Selth	23.00
CP114	<i>Calming the Waters: Initiatives for Asia Pacific Maritime Cooperation</i> by Sam Bateman and Stephen Bates (eds)	23.00
CP115	<i>Strategic Guidelines for Enabling Research and Development to Support Australian Defence</i> by Ken Anderson and Paul Dibb	17.00
CP116	<i>Security and Security Building in the Indian Ocean Region</i> by Sandy Gordon	24.00
CP117	<i>Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) in South Asia: India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka (Ceylon)</i> by Desmond Ball	17.50
CP118	<i>The Seas Unite: Maritime Cooperation in the Asia Pacific Region</i> by Sam Bateman and Stephen Bates (eds)	25.00
CP119	<i>In Search of a Maritime Strategy: The Maritime Element in Australian Defence Planning since 1901</i> by David Stevens (ed)	24.00
CP120	<i>Australian Defence Planning: Five Views from Policy Makers</i> by Helen Hookey and Denny Roy (eds)	15.00
CP121	<i>A Brief Madness: Australia and the Resumption of French Nuclear Testing</i> by Kim Richard Nossal and Carolyn Vivian	15.00

CP122	<i>Missile Diplomacy and Taiwan's Future: Innovations in Politics and Military Power</i> by Greg Austin (ed)	25.00
CP123	<i>Grey-Area Phenomena in Southeast Asia: Piracy, Drug Trafficking and Political Terrorism</i> by Peter Chalk	17.50
CP124	<i>Regional Maritime Management and Security</i> by Sam Bateman and Stephen Bates (eds)	24.00
CP125	<i>The Environment and Security: What are the Linkages?</i> by Alan Dupont (ed.)	17.00
CP126	<i>'Educating an Army': Australian Army Doctrinal Development and the Operational Experience in South Vietnam, 1965-72</i> by R.N. Bushby	17.50
CP127	<i>South Africa and Security Building in the Indian Ocean Rim</i> by Greg Mills	20.00
CP128	<i>The Shape of Things to Come: The US-Japan Security Relationship in the New Era</i> by Maree Reid	17.50
CP129	<i>Shipping and Regional Security</i> by Sam Bateman and Stephen Bates (eds)	20.00
CP130	<i>Bougainville 1988-98: Five Searches for Security in the North Solomons Province of Papua New Guinea</i> by Karl Claxton	23.00
CP131	<i>The Next Stage: Preventive Diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific Region</i> by Desmond Ball and Amitav Acharya (eds)	25.00
CP132	<i>Maritime Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region: Current Situation and Prospects</i> by Sam Bateman (ed)	23.00
CP133	<i>Maintaining the Strategic Edge: The Defence of Australia in 2015</i> by Desmond Ball (ed)	30.00
CP134	<i>An Independent Command: Command and Control of the 1st Australian Task Force in Vietnam</i> by R.W. Cable	17.50
CP135	<i>Armed Rebellion in the ASEAN States: Persistence and Implications</i> by Andrew Tan	23.00
CP136	<i>Burma's Secret Military Partners</i> by Andrew Selth	18.50
CP137	<i>Where Are They When You Need Them? Support Arrangements for Deployed Air Power</i> by Peter McLennan	26.00
CP138	<i>ASEAN, the Southeast Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone and the Challenge of Denuclearisation in Southeast Asia: Problems and Prospects</i> by Bilveer Singh	18.50
CP139	<i>The Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP): Its Record and Its Prospects</i> by Desmond Ball	18.50
CP140	<i>Wars of Conscience: Human Rights, National Security and Australia's Defence Policy</i> by John Hutcheson	26.00
CP141	<i>Civil-military Relations in Democratising Indonesia: The Potentials and Limits to Change</i> by Bilveer Singh	26.00
CP 142	<i>Giving Peace a Chance: Operation Lagoon, Bougainville, 1994: A Case of Military Action and Diplomacy</i> by Bob Breen	22.50
CP 143	<i>The Real C-Cubed: Culture, CAREERS & Climate, and how they affect capability</i> by Nick Jans with David Schmidtchen	26.00
CP 144	<i>The Human Face of Security</i> edited by David Dickens	22.50
CP145	<i>Masters of Terror: Indonesia's Military & Violence in East Timor in 1999</i> by Hamish McDonald and others	30.00
CP 146	<i>Small Arms Production and Transfers in Southeast Asia</i> by David Capie	22.50

Working Papers on Strategic and Defence Studies

- No. Title \$6.00 (excl. GST)
- WP225 *India's Strategic Posture: 'Look East' or 'Look West'?* by Sandy Gordon
- WP226 *Index to Parliamentary Questions on Defence for the Period 1989 to 1990* by Gary Brown
- WP227 *Australia and Papua New Guinea: Foreign and Defence Relations Since 1975* by Katherine Bullock
- WP228 *The Wrigley Report: An Exercise in Mobilisation Planning* by J.O. Langtry
- WP229 *Air Power, the Defence of Australia and Regional Security* by Desmond Ball
- WP230 *Current Strategic Developments and Implications for the Aerospace Industry* by Desmond Ball
- WP231 *Arms Control and Great Power Interests in the Korean Peninsula* by Gary Klintworth
- WP232 *Power, the Gun and Foreign Policy in China since the Tiananmen Incident* by Ian Wilson
- WP233 *The Gulf Crisis: Testing a New World Order?* by Amin Saikal and Ralph King
- WP234 *An Australian Perspective on Maritime CSBMs in the Asia-Pacific Region* by Desmond Ball and Commodore Sam Bateman RAN
- WP235 *Insurgency and the Transnational Flow of Information: A Case Study* by Andrew Selth
- WP236 *India's Security Policy: Desire and Necessity in a Changing World* by Sandy Gordon
- WP237 *The Introduction of the Civilian National Service Scheme for Youth in Papua New Guinea* by Lieutenant Colonel T.M. Boyce
- WP238 *Command, Control, Communications and Intelligence in the Gulf War* by Shaun Gregory
- WP239 *Reflections on Cambodian Political History: Backgrounder to Recent Developments* by Stephen R. Heder
- WP240 *The Asia-Pacific: More Security, Less Uncertainty, New Opportunities* by Gary Klintworth
- WP241 *A History of Australia's Space Involvement* by Matthew L. James
- WP242 *Antarctic Resources: A Dichotomy of Interest* by John Wells
- WP243 *'Call the Right to Intervene' in the Domestic Affairs of States* by Gary Klintworth
- WP244 *An Isolated Debating Society: Australia in Southeast Asia and the South Pacific* by Greg Johannes
- WP245 *Recent Developments in China's Domestic and Foreign Affairs: The Political and Strategic Implications for Northeast Asia* by Di Hua
- WP246 *The Evolution of US Maritime Power in the Pacific* by E.A. Olsen
- WP247 *Index to Parliamentary Questions on Defence, 1991* by Gary Brown
- WP248 *Call Out the Troops: An Examination of the Legal Basis for Australian Defence Force Involvement in 'Non-Defence' Matters* by Elizabeth Ward
- WP249 *The Australian Defence Force and the Total Force Policy* by Charles E. Heller
- WP250 *Mobilisation: The Gulf War in Retrospect* by James Wood
- WP251 *Mobilisation: The Benefits of Experience* by James Wood
- WP252 *Strategic Studies and Extended Deterrence in Europe: A Retrospective* by Andrew Butfoy
- WP253 *Geographic Information and Remote Sensing Technologies in the Defence of Australia* by Ken Granger
- WP254 *The Military Dimension of Common Security* by Andrew Butfoy
- WP255 *Taiwan's New Role in the Asia-Pacific Region* by Gary Klintworth

- WP256 *Focusing the CSBM Agenda in the Asia/Pacific Region: Some Aspects of Defence Confidence Building* by Paul Dibb
- WP257 *Defence and Industry: A Strategic Perspective* by Stewart Woodman
- WP258 *Russia and the Asia-Pacific Region* by Leszek Buszynski
- WP259 *National Security and Defence Policy Formation and Decision-Making in India* by Bruce Vaughn
- WP260 *A Question of Priorities: Australian and New Zealand Security Planning in the 1990s* by Stewart Woodman
- WP261 *Papua New Guinea-Australia Defence and Security Relations* by Peter I. Peipul
- WP262 *The Regional Security Outlook: An Australian Viewpoint* by Paul Dibb
- WP263 *Pakistan's Security Concerns: A Chinese Perspective* by Liu Jinkun
- WP264 *The Military Build-up in the Asia-Pacific Region: Scope, Causes and Implications for Security* by Andrew Mack and Desmond Ball
- WP265 *Principles of Australian Maritime Operations* by W.S.G. Bateman and R.J. Sherwood
- WP266 *Sino-Russian Detente and the Regional Implications* by Gary Klintworth
- WP267 *Australia and Asia-Pacific Regional Security* by Peter Jennings
- WP268 *Cambodia's Past, Present and Future* by Gary Klintworth
- WP269 *Australia's Aerial Surveillance Programme in the South Pacific: Review and New Options* by Wing Commander R.W. Grey
- WP270 *Strategic Culture in the Asia-Pacific Region (With Some Implications for Regional Security Cooperation)* by Desmond Ball
- WP271 *Australian Security Planning at the Crossroads: The Challenge of the Nineties* by Stewart Woodman
- WP272 *Index to Parliamentary Questions on Defence, 1992* by Gary Brown
- WP273 *Trends in Military Acquisitions in the Asia/Pacific Region: Implications for Security and Prospects for Constraints and Controls* by Desmond Ball
- WP274 *A Proposal for Cooperation in Maritime Security in Southeast Asia* by Wing Commander R.W. Grey
- WP275 *The Preparation and Management of Australian Contingents in UN Peacekeeping Operations* by Captain Russ Swinnerton RAN
- WP276 *The Future of Australia's Defence Relationship with the United States* by Paul Dibb
- WP277 *Russia's Military and the Northern Territories Issue* by Geoffrey Jukes
- WP278 *A Regional Regime for Maritime Surveillance, Safety and Information Exchanges* by Captain Russ Swinnerton RAN and Desmond Ball
- WP279 *The Political Role of the Singapore Armed Forces' Officer Corps: Towards a Military-Administrative State?* by Tim Huxley
- WP280 *The East Coast Armaments Complex (ECAC) Location Project: Strategic and Defence Aspects* by Desmond Ball
- WP281 *Rules of Engagement in Maritime Operations* by Captain Russ Swinnerton RAN
- WP282 *The Political and Strategic Outlook, 1994-2003: Global, Regional and Australian Perspectives* by Paul Dibb
- WP283 *Index to Parliamentary Questions on Defence, 1993* by Gary Brown
- WP284 *New Dimensions to the Japan-Australia Relationship: From Economic Preference to Political Cooperation* by Nobuyuki Takaki
- WP285 *Winners and Losers: South Asia After the Cold War* by Sandy Gordon
- WP286 *Australia and New Zealand: Towards a More Effective Defence Relationship* by Jim Rolfe
- WP287 *China's Policy Towards the Spratly Islands in the 1990s* by Sheng Lijun
- WP288 *How to Begin Implementing Specific Trust-Building Measures in the Asia-Pacific Region* by Paul Dibb

- WP289 *Burma's Arms Procurement Programme* by Andrew Selth
- WP290 *Developments in Signals Intelligence and Electronic Warfare in Southeast Asia* by Desmond Ball
- WP291 *India's Naval Strategy and the Role of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands* by D.N. Christie
- WP292 *Japan and Australia: A New Security Partnership?* by Naoko Sajima
- WP293 *Chinese Strategy and the Spratly Islands Dispute* by Brigadier Chris Roberts
- WP294 *Transnational Crime: The New Security Paradigm* by John McFarlane and Karen McLennan
- WP295 *Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) in North Korea* by Desmond Ball
- WP296 *The Emerging Geopolitics of the Asia-Pacific Region* by Paul Dibb
- WP297 *Maritime Strategy into the Twenty-First Century: Issues for Regional Navies* by Jack McCaffrie
- WP298 *The Cold War in Retrospect: Diplomacy, Strategy and Regional Impact* by Coral Bell
- WP299 *Australia-Indonesia Security Cooperation: For Better or Worse?* by Bob Lowry
- WP300 *Reflections on American Foreign Policy Strategy* by John Chipman
- WP301 *New Requirements for Multilateral Conflict Management by UN and Other Forces: Nordic Responses* by Jaana Karhilo
- WP302 *Developing Army Doctrine in the Post-Cold War Era* by Bill Houston
- WP303 *The Joint Patrol Vessel (JPV): A Regional Concept for Regional Cooperation* by Desmond Ball
- WP304 *Australian-American Relations after the Collapse of Communism* by Harry G. Gelber
- WP305 *Policy Coordination for Asia-Pacific Security and Stability* by Yukio Satoh
- WP306 *Force Modernisation in Asia: Towards 2000 and Beyond* by Paul Dibb
- WP307 *PMC, ARF and CSCAP: Foundations for a Security Architecture in the Asia-Pacific?* by Jörn Dosch
- WP308 *Burma's Intelligence Apparatus* by Andrew Selth
- WP309 *Burma's Defence Expenditure and Arms Industries* by Andrew Selth
- WP310 *Australia's Vulnerability to Information Attack: Towards a National Information Policy* by Adam Cobb
- WP311 *Australia, the US Alliance and Multilateralism in Southeast Asia* by Desmond Ball
- WP312 *From Distant Countries to Partners: the Japan-Australia Relationship* by Yukio Satoh
- WP313 *The Burma Navy* by Andrew Selth
- WP314 *Problems and Issues in Malaysia-Singapore Relations* by Andrew Tan
- WP315 *The Burma Air Force* by Andrew Selth
- WP316 *Australia's National Security into the Twenty-First Century* by Brigadier Mike Smith
- WP317 *Alliances, Alignments and the Global Order: The Outlook for the Asia-Pacific Region in the Next Quarter-Century* by Paul Dibb
- WP318 *The South African National Defence Force: Between Downsizing and New Capabilities?* by Greg Mills
- WP319 *The Evolution of China's Perception of Taiwan* by Sheng Lijun
- WP320 *UN Peacekeeping, UNIFIL and the Fijian Experience* by Jim Sanday
- WP321 *The Future of the ASEAN Regional Forum: An Australian View* by Alan Dupont
- WP322 *Singapore's Defence Policy in the New Millennium* by Andrew Tan
- WP323 *Responses to NATO's Eastward Expansion by the Russian Federation* by Alexei Mouraviev
- WP324 *The Remaking of Asia's Geopolitics* by Paul Dibb
- WP325 *The Nuclear Crisis in Asia: The Indian and Pakistani Nuclear Programmes* by Desmond Ball and Mohan Malik
- WP326 *Researching Security in East Asia: From 'Strategic Culture' to 'Security Culture'* by Pauline Kerr

- WP327 *Building the Tatmadaw: The Organisational Development of the Armed Forces in Myanmar, 1948-98* by Maung Aung Myoe
- WP238 *Drugs, Transnational Crime and Security in East Asia* by Alan Dupont
- WP329 *The Relevance of the Knowledge Edge* by Paul Dibb
- WP330 *The US-Australian Alliance: History and Prospects* by Desmond Ball
- WP331 *Implications of the East Asian Economic Recession for Regional Security Cooperation* by Desmond Ball
- WP332 *Strategic Information Warfare: A Concept* by Daniel T. Kuehl
- WP333 *Security Developments and Prospects for Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region, with Particular Reference to the Mekong River Basin* by Desmond Ball
- WP334 *Burma and Weapons of Mass Destruction* by Andrew Selth
- WP335 *Transnational Crime and Illegal Immigration in the Asia-Pacific Region: Background, Prospects and Countermeasures* by John McFarlane
- WP336 *Burma and Drugs: The Regime's Complicity in the Global Drug Trade* by Desmond Ball
- WP337 *Defence Strategy in the Contemporary Era* by Paul Dibb
- WP338 *The Burmese Armed Forces Next Century: Continuity or Change?* by Andrew Selth
- WP339 *Military Doctrine and Strategy in Myanmar: A Historical Perspective* by Maung Aung Myoe
- WP340 *The Evolving Security Architecture in the Asia-Pacific Region* by Desmond Ball
- WP341 *The Asian Financial Crisis: Corruption, Cronyism and Organised Crime* by John McFarlane
- WP342 *The Tatmadaw in Myanmar since 1988: An Interim Assessment* by Maung Aung Myoe
- WP343 *Cambodia and Southeast Asia* by Tony Kevin
- WP344 *The Principle of Non-Intervention and ASEAN: Evolution and Emerging Challenges* by Herman Kraft
- WP345 *Will America's Alliances in the Asia-Pacific Region Endure?* by Paul Dibb
- WP346 *Officer Education and Leadership Training in the Tatmadaw: A Survey* by Maung Aung Myoe
- WP347 *The Prospects for Southeast Asia's Security* by Paul Dibb
- WP348 *The Army's Capacity to Defend Australia Offshore: The Need for a Joint Approach* by John Caligari
- WP349 *Interpreting China-Indonesia Relations: 'Good-Neighbourliness', 'Mutual Trust' and 'All-round Cooperation'* by He Kai
- WP350 *Strategic Trends in the Asia-Pacific Region* by Paul Dibb
- WP351 *Burma's Order of Battle: An Interim Assessment* by Andrew Selth
- WP352 *Landmines in Burma: The Military Dimension* by Andrew Selth
- WP353 *Japanese Airborne SIGINT Capabilities* by Desmond Ball and Euan Graham
- WP 354 *The Indonesian Military Business Complex: Origins, Course & Future* by Bilveer Singh
- WP 355 *Professor A.D. Trendall and His Band of Classical Cryptographers* by R.S. Merrillees
- WP 356 *Factionalism and the Ethnic Insurgent Organisations* by Des Ball & Hazel Lang
- WP 357 *ABM vs BMD: The Issue of Ballistic Missile Defence* by Ron Huisken
- WP 358 *South Africa's Defence Industry: A Template for Middle Powers?* by Greg Mills & Martin Edmonds
- WP 359 *The New Submarine Combat Information System and Australia's Emerging Information Warfare Architecture* by Desmond Ball
- WP 360 *Missile Defence: Trends, Conflicts and Remedies* by Desmond Ball
- WP 361 *Indonesian Security Responses to resurgent Papuan Separatism: An Open Source Intelligence Case Study* by Matthew N. Davies*

No.	Title	\$8.00 (excl. GST)
WP 362	<i>ANZUS: Life after 50: Alliance Management in the 21st Century</i> by Ron Huisken	
WP 363	<i>A Strategic Framework for Missile Defence</i> by Ron Huisken	
WP 364	<i>'The First War of the 21st Century': Asymmetric Hostilities and the Norms of Conduct</i> by Coral Bell	
WP 365	<i>The Utility and Limits of The International Coalition against Terrorism</i> by Paul Dibb	
WP 366	<i>QDR 2001: America's New Military Roadmap</i> by Ron Huisken	
WP 367	<i>Malaysia's Security Perspectives</i> by Andrew Tan	
WP 368	<i>Asia Pacific Security: Taking Charge Collectively</i> by Ron Huisken	
WP 369	<i>The War on Terror and Air Combat Power: A Word of Warning for Defence Planners</i> by Paul Dibb	
WP 370	<i>Organised Crime and Terrorism in the Asia-Pacific Region: The Reality and the Response</i> by John McFarlane	
WP 371	<i>The Sydney Games – The Trouble-free Games</i> by Clive Williams	
WP 372	<i>Iraq (November 2001-November 2002) America's Checks and Balances Prevail Over Unilateralism</i> by Ron Huisken	
WP 373	<i>The Kopassus Dilemma: Should Australia Re-Engage?</i> by Alan Dupont	

* The price of this publication is \$12 (excl. GST)

Ordering Information

- We will accept either one-off or standing orders.
- Cost of packaging and postage by surface mail is included in all book prices. A 15% discount is allowed for books collected personally from the Strategic and Defence Studies Centre.
- Method of payment: Cheque or money order, payable to Australian National University, OR Bankcard/Mastercard/Visa/American Express.
GST is payable on books supplied within Australia.
- Method of payment for overseas customers: Bank draft in Australian dollars, payable to Australian National University OR Bankcard/Mastercard/Visa/American Express.
- Please include payment or credit card details with your order and forward it to:
Publications Sales
Strategic and Defence Studies Centre
Building 6, Fellows Road
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200 Australia
Fax: 61 (0)2 6248 0816, e-mail:sdsc@anu.edu.au.

Abstracts of recent SDSC publications and a list of publications in print are available through the centre's home page: <<http://sdsc.anu.edu.au>>. A full list of publications will be sent out on request.