GOH KENG SWEE COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE SEMINAR 2016

SEMINAR REPORT

6-7 October 2016
SAFTI Military Institute

RSiS
Nanyang Technological University

S. RAJARATNAM
SCHOOL OF
INTERNATIONAL
STUDIES

SAF - NTU
a c a d e m y

Seminar Report

GOH KENG SWEE COMMAND
AND STAFF COLLEGE SEMINAR 2016

The Changing Character of Conflict and the Challenges
for the Contemporary Armed Forces

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Goh Keng Swee Command and Staff College (GKS CSC) Seminar 2016 was held at SAFTI Military Institute in Singapore from 6 to 7 October 2016. Since its inception in 2010, GKS CSC Seminar has provided a unique and important forum on topics that are current and relevant to the education of military leaders. GKS CSC Seminar 2016 has continued to create knowledge that is useful to professional military education. It also provides opportunities for networking and professional exchange among participants and speakers. Throughout the two-day programme, participants attended a series of panel discussions that featured experts from both the academic and military professional communities. The theme for GKS CSC Seminar 2016 was "Changing Character of Conflict and the Challenges for the Armed Forces". Some of the key topics discussed included Southeast Asian military modernisation, hybrid threats, the future of warfare, civil-military relations, and the whole-of-government approach towards security.

GKS CSC Seminar 2016 has played an important role in engaging key thinkers and military practitioners to discuss the key challenges of the changing characteristics of conflict. These challenges are further compounded by porous borders and technological advancements. It has provided an opportunity for participants to foster a better understanding of regional issues, and the challenges for the armed forces. Participants and speakers alike found the seminar useful and engaging.

OPENING REMARKS

Rear Admiral Giam Hock Koon
Commandant, SAFTI Military Institute
Singapore Armed Forces

Rear Admiral (RADM) Giam Hock Koon kicked-off the seminar by welcoming the Guest-of-Honour, Mr Peter Ho, Senior Advisor, Centre for Strategic Futures, members of the SAFTI Military Institute, and participants of the GKS CSC Seminar 2016. RADM Giam highlighted the importance of the seminar in providing Singapore Armed Forces (SAF) military officers with an opportunity to engage with leading thinkers on current security issues and their implications for the armed forces.

RADM Giam also highlighted how conflicts had become increasingly amorphous in recent years. The Seminar had underscored the critical importance of learning to the SAF in order to better adapt to the changing nature of conflicts. In this regard, RADM Giam expressed hope that the theme of this year's seminar would help to address some of the issues faced by professional militaries today. RADM Giam also spoke about how other capabilities beyond tactics and advanced platforms, such as habits of mind and a strong organisational culture of learning, could also contribute to achieving of the aim.

Lastly, RADM Giam encouraged this year's participants to keep an open mind and to participate actively and engage in dialogue with the speakers at the seminar. RADM Giam also thanked the speakers for accepting the invitation to speak at the seminar and expressed confidence that the resulting experience and the meeting of minds would enrich the speakers' perspectives.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Mr Peter Ho
Senior Advisor, Centre for Strategic Futures
Singapore

Mr Peter Ho began his keynote address by highlighting the fact that regardless of one's occupation or organisation, change and disruptive trends would always be a constant. This was due to the complicated and complex nature of the world. Mr Ho went on to highlight the differences between complex and complicated, with the biggest difference being the unpredictable nature of interactions in a complex world. This would lead to emergent and unanticipated behaviour, which would eventually result in surprise and create a potential for discontinuous and non-linear shocks. People in a complex world should not be surprised by proverbial "black swans"—rare, hard to predict events with a large impact. Mr Ho also highlighted the importance of the notion of the "unknown unknowns," which was discussed in the memoirs of former U.S. Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld. Mr Ho underlined that it was critical that audience members understand both concepts, as they formed the wider defence community.

In the context of the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997, the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, the Eurozone Crisis in 2009, as well as the drop in oil prices in 2014, many have argued in hindsight that although there were clear warning signs prior to these incidents, nothing was done about it. Mr Ho then discussed the "butterfly effect", which was first conceptualised by Dr Edward Lorenz in the 1950s. Underlying this concept of "butterfly effect", Dr Lorenz said that the flap of a butterfly's wings in Brazil could set off a tornado in Texas. In our context, a small disturbance in the complex system of interactions could lead to a very great and unpredictable outcome in another part of the system.

Mr Ho brought up the example of Mohamed Bouazizi, who initiated a small protest which at first seemed like an inconsequential event, but eventually led to the Arab Spring of 2010, which had drastic consequences ranging from failed governments and civil war, to the rise of the Islamic State (IS).

Mr Ho also introduced the importance of "retrospective coherence," or hindsight, which would be useful in understanding past events, but not predicting future events. Looking backwards, the state of affairs always looked logical. Furthermore, the human tendency to (over) estimate the probability and likelihood of similar things happening in the future—the "availability heuristic"—might not be effective in predicting future events. Mr Ho then explained retrospective coherence in the context of Singapore's national security.

Mr Ho illustrated the evolution of national security challenges that Singapore faced since independence, from the Macdonald House bombing in 1965 to the recently foiled plot to attack Marina Bay by firing rockets from Batam. Thus, he concluded that national security challenges had come full circle. He then quoted from Mr Lee Kuan Yew, who stated that neither the past nor the future was pre-ordained, and that there would always be unexpected problems in the past and in the future.

Mr Ho also introduced a new concept, that of the "black elephant," which he described as a cross between a "black swan" and the "elephant in the room." He described "black elephants" as events and problems that seemed improbable and surprising when it really should not be, and a problem which was visible, yet not dealt with while the warning signs were ignored. This "black elephant" was a result of human cognitive biases, or blind spots. For example, Brexit was a "black elephant" that arose from cognitive biases within the British Government, with many agencies such as the British military failing to adequately plan for the one scenario which was likely to happen. Mr Ho also cited other examples of military failures as a result of cognitive biases, such as Pearl Harbour and the Malayan Campaign. He also cited Mr S. Rajaratnam, former Minister for Foreign Affairs, who highlighted that the pace of change was actually accelerating and that the only way to cope would be to have a future-oriented society.

Mr Ho highlighted that the conundrum for the policymaker would be the issue of planning for the future, where one would be caught up by "black swans", "unknown unknowns", and perhaps "black elephants". Although we cannot predict the future, there are ways of looking ahead. There might be various lenses through which we are able to better plan for future crises. Thus, the solution would be to look through a wide angle lens which would allow one to better understand the broader trends of critical issues. Highly complex problems today require various departments and government agencies to work together in a Whole-of-Government or even a Whole-of-Nation approach. For example, Singapore had approaches such as Total Defence and SG Secure to tackle problems that are more complex in nature.

In conclusion, Mr Ho encouraged participants to look beyond the short-term, towards building future resilience as a better solution to deal with long-term challenges, and never to let the lessons of a crisis go to waste.

Questions and Answers Section

The Question and Answer session started with a participant asking what the value of history was, given that history was not prone to repeating itself. Thus, looking to the past was not a sure way of predicting what would happen in the future. Mr Ho answered that it would be the type of lesson learned from history that was important. He cited the examples of Pearl Harbour and the Yom Kippur war, and the importance of looking beyond blind spots and learning how to apply these lessons.

Another participant asked whether Singapore was ready for Donald Trump to be the U.S. President. Mr Ho replied that no one would really be prepared for a Trump Presidency and it would be an understatement to say that he would be an unusual precedent in the White House. The pre-eminence of the United States as a leading superpower also meant that there would be unpredictable consequences.

The third question centred on how disruptive technologies such as Uber and 3D printing had also changed their respective industries. Thus, in the realm of security, there could be potential disruptive technologies and trends beyond terrorism. Mr Ho replied that the current wave of technology, such as 3D printing, artificial intelligence and data analytics, would have profound positive and negative consequences. In Singapore, the consequences of such technology could have very profound negative consequences on our economy and security. Future waves of technological advancement would also bring about change at a quicker pace than ever before.

The last question was regarding Mr Ho's earlier observations that building organisations which were too "lean and mean" could have negative repercussions on resilience. However, in the context of Singapore and the SAF, the finite nature of manpower requirements meant that there must be some streamlining. Thus, the question was whether there were other ways to build resilience within this context. Mr Ho clarified that resilience was not necessarily related to size, but when a system was too lean, it left no spare capacity or "fat" in the system to deal with shock. He then used the example of the SARS crisis in 2003 when the Ministry of Defence and the SAF were the only "fat" in the system that could be mobilised at short notice to deal with the crisis. This highlighted how spare capacity was needed in any system to deal with such shocks.

KEYNOTE SPEECH

Professor Ralf Emmers
Associate Dean, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Professor Ralf Emmers began his address by reminding the audience of the mandate and themes of the GKS CSC Seminar 2016. Prof Emmers stated that although the Seminar had evolved over the years, its mandate, which was to educate the GKS CSC students on issues pertaining to geo-politics as well as strategic studies, had not changed. To this end, the themes of the Seminar had been crafted with professional relevance and currency in mind. Prof Emmers also highlighted how RSIS was privileged in being able to share its network of speakers and practitioners with GKS CSC, and encouraged the participants to engage the speakers.

Referring to Mr Peter Ho's earlier Keynote Address on the subject of complexity, Prof Emmers noted that seminars like the GKS CSC Seminar, as well as the GKS CSC itself, encouraged the seeking of the most relevant perspectives to address complexity. The Seminar would address some of these issues through the engagement of the speakers, who would provide new perspectives. In turn, this would allow the participants to discover better ways to deal with complexities which were increasingly becoming the "new normal". Prof Emmers also noted that the characteristics of conflict had changed very rapidly in recent years. Conflicts had also become increasingly transnational and amorphous. Social media, as well as porous borders, also meant that people were able to move more freely to and from conflict zones.

Prof Emmers concluded his speech by expressing hope that the seminar would not only seek to address some of the existing questions, but also leave the participants with more to think about and engage the speakers.

PANEL 1: THE CHANGING NATURE OF CONFLICT

The South China Sea and Its Impact on Security in the Asia Pacific

Dr Collin Koh
Research Fellow, Maritime Security Programme, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Dr Collin Koh started his presentation by highlighting that the key point of his discussion was the ramifications of the militarisation of the South China Sea by claimant nations in the last two years. To better understand the ramifications, Dr Koh argued that there needed to be a better understanding of what militarisation actually meant, as well as what claimant states were doing in terms of the militarisation of the South China Sea. This would then allow for better comprehension of the risks of the militarising of coast guards in the South China Sea, as well as the prospects of naval arms control.

Dr Koh noted that military spending in the region had increased, with China dwarfing the rest of the Southeast Asian nations. China had also engaged in large-scale island building in the South China Sea, which led to considerable unease by surrounding countries and other claimant states. Specifically, Dr Koh highlighted how China had landed civilian airliners on the disputed Fiery Cross Reef, and the considerable scale as well as pace of construction undertaken by China in the South China Sea.

With regard to Southeast Asian nations, Dr Koh said that Malaysia had conducted past naval exercises in disputed waters. Separately, the Philippines had also constructed a 1 KM runway on one of the islands that could accommodate C-130s. Joint exercises conducted between the United States and the Philippines near the disputed islands had brought accusations from China that these exercises had been targeted specifically at them. The revival of the combat air wing in the Philippine Air Force and the basing of these aircraft near the disputed islands had also led to accusations of militarisation, albeit on the periphery.

Turning his attention to Taiwan, Dr Koh stated that in the 1990s, Taiwan deployed marines to Taiping Island. Later on, Taiwan withdrew these marines and deployed the coast guard to the island. However, the arming of these coast guards with weapons that were widely considered to be offensive in nature also raised questions about whether these islands were being militarised. In Vietnam's case, Dr Koh highlighted that Vietnam had also built structures and deployed troops to disputed waters in a bid to assert its claims. Dr Koh further noted that in this day and age, where weapon systems were no longer as static as they used to be, the

building of a single airstrip was a major game changer as it enabled troops and weapons to be deployed quickly through the use of cargo planes. Thus, the length of China's runway on Fiery Cross Reef had raised concerns that it would be able to deploy heavy weapons quickly and in large numbers in times of tension and conflict.

Along with the evolving nature of military forces worldwide, Dr Koh observed that the nature of the military forces involved in the South China Sea had also changed over the years. Offensive forces had become more mobile, kinetic and persistent. The increasing range of offensive weapon systems also meant that they need not be deployed on the disputed islands permanently and could be sited on the periphery. The increased emphasis on amphibious sealift capabilities and amphibious assault forces by claimant states had enabled these countries to be able to deploy and respond quickly.

Moving on to the question of whether China, and in particular the PLA would resort to force in the South China Sea, Dr Koh noted the increasing trend of militarisation as well as the increasing number of incidents involving Chinese military or paramilitary forces. An increasing number of coast guards in the region had also equipped themselves with offensive weapons. In conclusion, Dr Koh noted that past measures to reduce the likelihood of conflict had not been very effective, and remained tricky today due to a lack of a governing body as well as the numerous considerations in coming up with a binding agreement that all claimant states could agree with.

The Future Character of War and Its Impact on the Region Considered within the Context of Australia's Defence White Paper 2016 and the Australian Command and Staff College

Group Captain Dennis Tan
Course Director and Director of Studies Air Force,
Australian Command and Staff College
Australian Defence Force

Group Captain Dennis Tan started his presentation by giving the participants advice about what the future nature of conflict would look like—uncertain, complex and violent. GPCPT Tan then highlighted that in order to understand the character of conflict in the future, we would need to understand the nature and character of war. In his opinion, the nature of war had and would remain constant, but the character of war was constantly changing. The nature of war would always

be a violent clash of wills to meet an objective, irrespective of changes in other spheres such as technology. However, the character of war had evolved over time as a result of the learning and adaptation associated with drivers of change. GPCPT Tan reminded the audience that there was no war or conflict without bloodshed, and political leaders had to be aware that there was no easy or non-violent way to fight a war. Also, the vast spectrum of warfare guaranteed complexity due to the human aspects of conflict and war.

Referring to the 2016 Australian Defence White Paper, GPCPT Tan highlighted that the Australian Government had noted very complex and different challenges in the years ahead, namely that of the threat to space and cyber-space. He also noted how the Australian Defence establishment now had to grapple with issues such as climate change as well as disaster relief. Conflicts had always been complex, from ancient battles to modern warfare, and would remain so. The changing distribution of power, as well as various other factors such as military modernisation and the continued threat of terrorism, meant that the future character of conflict in the region would be difficult to quantify.

Focusing on the region, especially the Indo-Pacific, GPCPT Tan noted how recent Australian Defence White Papers in 2013 and in 2016 had increasingly shifted their focus from the Asia Pacific to the Indo-Pacific. The latter encompassed both the Pacific and Indian Oceans, defined by the geographically expanding interests and reach of China and India while acknowledging the strategic role of the United States. This shift would allow Australia to better identify the core of its strategic interests. A shift to the Indo-Pacific would also put Australia at the centre of the region and would help defence planners better define its strategic interests. He also highlighted the six key drivers underlying the development of Australia's security environment up till 2035: (i) the U.S.-China relationship; (ii) the challenges to a Rules Based Global Order (RGBO); (iii) the growing threat of terrorism; (iv) fragility of states within Australia's immediate region; (v) the increasing pace of modernisation in the region; as well as (vi) the increasing threats in space and cyberspace.

GPCPT Tan also highlighted how the relationship between the U.S. and China would be the most important factor in determining the region's security. According to GPCPT Tan, Australia predicted that the United States would remain the pre-eminent military power in the region and an important strategic partner for Australia. Challenges to RGBO would also play a critical role as countries in the region had grown economically and sought to assert their influence and challenge existing rules. The modernisation of militaries and introduction of new weapon systems in the region could also be viewed positively, as it meant that no country really had an edge over another.

Lastly, GPCPT Tan gave an overview of the Australian Command and Staff College and its role in international engagement by bringing together participants from different nations. GPCPT Tan raised several benefits including the enhancement of critical thinking and fostering of cooperation among participants. He concluded that whilst the nature of conflicts might change, the development of people skills and human networks among different countries was important to some degree in averting these conflicts.

The Southeast Asian Military Modernisation: Past and Future, Evolution and Management

Dr Wu Shang-Su
Research Fellow, Military Studies Programme,
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Singapore

Dr Wu Shang-Su began his presentation by outlining a few key factors underpinning the subject of military modernisation in the region, namely that of historical background, existence of obsolescence, geostrategic circumstances as well as the estimation for the future. Historically, the countries in Southeast Asia which gained independence after the Second World War faced the problem of building a military. The most likely source of weapons was thus the surplus equipment left over from the Second World War, as well as arms left behind by former colonial masters. This was especially prevalent from 1945 to 1975. Dr Wu noted that some of these weapon systems were still active today due to the lack of funds for military upgrading.

Dr Wu highlighted that with the end of the Cold War, military aid to countries in the region had been limited in quantity. This had also been augmented by the fact that weapon systems had become more expensive to purchase, which in turn meant that countries in the region tended to make purchases in smaller numbers. He also argued that with the increasing cost of arms procurement and with a limited budget, the army had often been overlooked in favour of the air force or the navy. Dr Wu argued that with smaller budgets, there would also be issues with maintenance of the equipment and ultimately, obsolescence. Thus, Dr Wu's recommendations included some benchmarks to determine obsolescence, such as service time, and upgraded records on the number of nations that the equipment was still in service

with. Dr Wu also alluded to how a lack of budget could also lead to a snowball effect, where an increasing number of equipment grew increasingly obsolete and was not replaced in time due to a lack of funds.

Dr Wu concluded that political leadership, foreign military aid, and technological breakthroughs would be the three most important factors that determined any future changes.

Panel 1: Questions and Answers Section

The first question was whether there would be more potential for unity of efforts, alliances, and partnerships within the Indo-Pacific region rather than just the Asia Pacific region. GPCPT Tan responded that the core of Australia's strategic weight was cooperation within the countries, which would ultimately give rise to the aforementioned collective unity of effort. Cooperation was also important as he believed that no country could operate unilaterally, and seminars like the GKS CSC served to underline the importance of such cooperation. Strong military-to-military relationships between Australia and its strategic partners were important for moving forward into the future.

Another participant asked Dr Koh whether the rise of the coast guards in the South China Sea could be perceived as the rise of "black elephants" entering the room, and whether this would be the reality of the situation in the South China Sea. Dr Koh replied that it would be impossible to get the "black elephants" to leave the room, not least because of the military modernisation that countries in the region had undertaken in recent years. The proliferation of coast guards was a reality and it would be more realistic to improve the professionalism of sailors and servicemen rather than mechanisms and agreements, as the former were at the forefront of any conflict.

Dr Koh was also asked by another participant about what would be a good command structure and system of escalation in order to avoid potential political repercussions. Dr Koh replied that our systems of dealing with such incidents should have more predictability as well as safeguards. In his opinion, Standard Operating Procedures would be important when dealing with such incidents so as to ensure predictability of action. Another useful mitigating factor for de-conflicting potential incidents would be the use of a common radio frequency.

PANEL 2: INTEGRATING SOFT AND HARD POWER

ASEAN in the midst of Sino-U.S. Relations in the Asia Pacific

Assistant Professor Evan Resnick
Coordinator of the U.S. Programme,
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Singapore

Assistant Professor Evan Resnick began his presentation by looking at American grand strategy in the Asia Pacific since the end of the Second World War. He concluded that the United States had consistently pursued a grand strategy of maritime hegemony in East Asia since the end of the Second World War. Its grand strategy could be divided into two time periods; that of the period during the Cold War from the late 1940s and the period after the 1990s. The first period saw the United States monopolise the post-war occupation of Japan as well as an array of bilateral military alliances with countries in the Asia Pacific such as Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines in addition to Australia and New Zealand. The United States operated the world's only blue water navy during the Cold War as the Soviet Union's navy generally remained inferior to that of the United States during that period. Due to its invasion by Germany during the Second World War, the Soviet Union remained pre-occupied with defending the country's western borders and its sphere of influence over Eastern Europe.

Asst Prof Resnick stated that China had interests in East Asia, but unlike the Soviet Union, lacked the power to exert its influence in the region. After the Communists came to power, the Chinese Government began to spread its ideology in the region, intervening in the Korean War as well as in Tibet and engaging in coercive diplomacy with Taiwan. While it had a large standing army, it was for the most part poorly equipped and China lacked the ability to defend its power over air and sea. Up till 2008, China had pursued a peaceful rise strategy which was more conciliatory in nature. However, in the aftermath of the financial crisis in 2008, China embarked on a programme to expand as well as modernise its military, via a massive increase in military expenditure which allowed it to yield far greater military capabilities. It also allowed China to behave more belligerently in the South China Sea than it did previously. The Chinese military as well as its Coast Guard now possessed more than 500 ships and operated them almost exclusively within the region, with numbers continuing to rise.

Chinese A2/AD capabilities have also improved since 2008, and China has continued to grow these capabilities. However, Asst Prof Resnick argued that American commitment to East Asia would need to be scaled down in the medium to long-term as the economy was unable to sustain such an effort with high debt

levels and current account deficits. East Asia was not the only concern that the United States had as a global superpower. In contrast, China had the advantage of concentrating only on a single region. Asst Prof Resnick also argued that by scaling down its commitment in East Asia, this actually bolstered the United States' ability to resolve violent and diplomatic disputes affecting the balance of power in the region.

To add to his case, Asst Prof Resnick opined that military size would not dampen the resolve of the belligerent and in some cases would not determine the outcome. The balance of interests was more important than military size in determining the outcome of any conflict. Looking at the South China Sea and the Cross Strait relations between China and Taiwan, the strong U.S. military presence in the area exacerbated Chinese insecurity. Although China deemed these issues to be integral to its survival, this might not be the case for the United States. In Asst Prof Resnick's view, this only served to encourage greater Chinese militarisation in the region and made the Chinese less willing to accept any form of diplomatic coercion.

Summing up, Asst Prof Resnick asserted that as long as China refrained from interfering in commercial activities in the South and East China Seas, the United States should look to retract some of its forces from the region. Also, the United States should engage in greater soft balancing as a way to engage an increasingly belligerent China. Support for ASEAN would also be important for the United States to counter the influence of China within ASEAN nation states.

Strategic Narratives: Shaping Public Opinion and Influencing War

Colonel Yang Si Cheng
Director (Information Directorate),
MINDEF Communications Organisation
Singapore

Colonel Yang Si Cheng began his presentation by highlighting the importance of communication as a form of soft power as well as the trajectory of communication in the near future. Hard power employed the use of coercion and force in order to elicit a change in another party's position, thus it could be understood to include military force as well as economic sanctions. On the other hand, soft power employed the use of persuasion through public diplomacy, culture as well as the behaviour of others. COL Yang brought up the example of the effective use of soft power by highlighting how South Korea was able to export its culture through K-Pop as well as television dramas.

COL Yang then highlighted how the integration of hard and soft power could be best described in the context of hybrid warfare, which gained prominence after the annexation of Crimea. In today's context, COL Yang explained that potential adversaries could employ information and cyber-tools to exploit social and political fissures in order to reduce and attrite the will and commitment of the population. The information revolution, especially in the last decade, has enabled unprecedented access to the Internet and has also changed the way in which people receive information. Where it was once adequate to engage traditional media in the past, COL Yang said that it was now a competition for the mindshare of people. One implication of this easy access to multiple media outlets was the potential for disinformation which could then be taken as the truth.

Thus, the implications of information and hybrid warfare for Singapore, as well as MINDEF and the SAF, could be grave. As a small country with an open economy, Singapore could be subjected to various influences. Thus, hybrid warfare and misinformation would definitely affect the morale of Singaporeans in one way or another. COL Yang explained that the role of MINDEF Strategic Communications was important on many levels, not only within the SAF, but also within the public domain. Thus, the challenge would be to convey complex information, counter narratives and facts in ways that were relatable to target audiences without coming across as "preachy." This was especially important in an age where there was an abundance of information sources for the reader to be engaged. Partnering with other websites as well as the publication of human interest stories would also help pique the interests of the public.

In addition, COL Yang explained how a "whole-of-government" approach was important in synchronising important messages as well as to achieve synergy and alignment in the messages that were being broadcasted. Giving mainstream media such as The Straits Times and the National Geographic access to military courses also helped in giving recognition to the sacrifices of Singaporeans, in addition to the realism of National Service training. A strong presence on social media was also an important outlet for strategic communications to attract and engage audiences.

Looking ahead, COL Yang stated that MINDEF was looking at better analytics as well as sense-making to construct a more comprehensive information picture. This would allow MINDEF to further understand the target audience in order to develop new content as well as delivery methods to better engage them.

Designing Design: Planning National Strategies in an Uncertain World

Professor Tomonori Yoshizaki
Director of Policy Simulation, National Institute for Defense Studies
Japan

Professor Tomonori Yoshizaki started his presentation by reminding the audience that change was the only constant in the world today, and that thinking out of the box was necessary in order to come up with new perspectives. In the context of Japan, changes in perspectives from 2010 onwards allowed defence planners to better understand the importance of maritime security and Japan's strategic location, which covered much of the coastal areas of China as well as Russia.

In the context of simulating probable future events, Prof Yoshizaki reiterated the importance of thinking about the "black swan" as well as the impact of such highly improbable situations. Using the 2011 Tōhoku earthquake and the resulting tsunami which resulted in a nuclear meltdown as an example, Prof Yoshizaki cited this incident as one which lacked critical crisis management in all areas. Thus, Prof Yoshizaki argued that while there was a need for a "strategy from above," there was also a need for "strategy from below," which would include simulating or roleplaying potential situations.

Prof Yoshizaki also highlighted that the military was often called upon in non-military crises and it was precisely these missions that had shaped a new role for the military and compelled the military to think out of the box. From a linear, top-down approach of command and control, in most non-military missions, the military establishment would have to work in a lateral manner which involved cooperation and coordination with other organisations as well as the local community. Policy simulation, in this instance, would be important in equipping key decision makers with the necessary ability to think out of the box with a limited freedom of action and with a sense of bounded rationality.

In addition, Prof Yoshizaki stated that it was important to know the reasons behind failures in order to be able to better plan for future scenarios. He also emphasised that challenging the normal in terms of our thinking as well as our current Standard Operating Procedures were essential in helping us understand how we could carry out better future planning. Concluding his presentation, Prof Yoshizaki suggested that the conceptual model of "sensing, seizing and transforming" was essential in helping the military better plan for future challenges. In the context of

regional security concerns, this would mean enhancing situational awareness to better sense the unexpected. This would enable the seizing of opportunities to forge new relationships and guidelines with key partners as well as transforming organisations to deal with these changing threats. To this end, Prof Yoshizaki reiterated that change was the only constant and the status quo was dynamic and constantly changing.

Panel 2: Questions and Answers Section

A question was raised to Asst Prof Resnick on the concepts of hard and soft power and whether China had been successful in integrating both concepts in dealing with the South China Sea issue. Asst Prof Resnick responded by saying that China was more successful when it was pursuing a peaceful rise strategy a decade ago. During that time, its economic model was more attractive and its toned-down foreign policy made countries in the region more inclined to cooperate with it while generating a considerable amount of goodwill. However, since the last financial crisis in 2008, China had increasingly chosen more coercive tools of statecraft. In Asst Prof Resnick's opinion, China had made some territorial gains, albeit at the expense of alienating much of the rest of the region.

Another participant asked COL Yang how MINDEF was able to send messages without being "preachy" as well as a specific illustration of such a message. Using National Service as an example, COL Yang highlighted the importance of the choice of words in conveying a message when rolling out a new initiative allowing pre-enlistees to indicate their interest. The use of the word "interest" rather than "preference" or "choice" conveyed different meanings, which carried different implications and was important in the crafting of the policy.

Prof Yoshizaki was also asked by a participant what a Trump Presidency in November 2016 would mean for the national strategy of Japan as well as for the militaries in the region. Prof Yoshizaki responded by stating that Japan had certain simulations which dealt with these scenarios, and there were two choices: to be more isolationist or to be more engaged in the region. Prof Yoshizaki stated that the right answer would be to find a balance between these two extremes and these two scenarios. Responding directly to the scenario of a Trump Presidency, Prof Yoshizaki stated that pragmatism would be important in this case, with a strategic partnership between the two countries and the positive outcomes of such a partnership over the years being important points for a businessman like Donald Trump.

Asst Prof Resnick was also asked how China's demographics and constraints, which were different from that of the United States, would affect China's rise and expansion. Asst Prof Resnick responded by stating that there were many domestic political variables which would likely inhibit China from behaving in a typical in "Napoleonic" manner. The greying of China's population and serious economic concerns, coupled with the fact that China was still very much an undeveloped country, had serious implications on future economic expansion. Upon closer reflection and taking into consideration the factors above, Asst Prof Resnick concluded that the Chinese threat could very well be overstated.

The Chair also asked Prof Yoshizaki whether policy simulations yielded better results in a student environment or whether they were more effective when they were carried out by policymakers who may have cognitive biases. Prof Yoshizaki responded by stating that the most important output of policy simulation was for the participants to be stimulated in their decision-making process. That being said, policy simulation thus became important at different levels for different purposes. The interaction between policymakers and students thus became important in injecting realism and flexibility into the policy simulation.

The last question centred on North Korea and nuclear proliferation. Although sanctions were placed on North Korea by the international community, they were unsuccessful. Thus, in running policy simulations, what were the potential concerns for Japan and what was the next step that the international community could take short of an all-out war to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons on the Korean peninsula. Prof Yoshizaki responded that there must be planning for the worst-case scenario, that of an unthinkable nuclear holocaust and then working backwards in the days leading up to such a scenario. The definition of rationality must also be flexible and must be considered by policy planners in order to better anticipate different scenarios, as the definition varies among countries. Asst Prof Resnick also responded by saying that the United States operated in a state of wilful denial in the 1990s when it unsuccessfully tried to deal with North Korea's nuclear programme. Other realities included a China which would prefer North Korea as a nominal allied state for strategic purposes. The strategic patience approach undertaken by the Obama Administration was, in Asst Prof Resnick's opinion, ineffective in convincing North Korea to abandon its nuclear programme as the country's leaders saw nuclear weapons as the only trump card. COL Yang added that North Korea was a perfect example of a country where soft power would not work. Sources of soft power, such as online and mainstream media would also be ineffective in a country like North Korea, where the regime tightly controlled the population as well as information flows into the country.

PANEL 3: KINETIC AND NON-KINETIC MEANS IN OPERATIONS

The Centre of Gravity in Conventional and Unconventional Hybrid Warfare

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim
Associate Professor, Military Studies Programme, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim started by highlighting that over the years, a number of terms had been used to describe the changing characteristics of warfare. The current model of warfare—which Assoc Prof Hashim called the Westphalian model of warfare—was where states were fighting states. Pre-Westphalian warfare was a combination of regular, irregular, criminal activity and military forces, before the state managed to enshrine regular military forces as the legitimate organisation for war in the state's hands. In the last 20 to 25 years, the ability of the state to control the instruments of warfare had been breached, sometimes deliberately by the state, to allow other forces to conduct activities on its behalf. This was because some states did not want their regular forces to be directly involved, or wanted the ability to deny any accusations. As such, Assoc Prof Hashim argued that warfare was returning to a pre-Westphalian model where battle space extended into the civilian sphere.

Assoc Prof Hashim explained that hybrid warfare was a term that followed asymmetric warfare. However, hybrid warfare was not a prediction of what future war was going to be like. Instead, it was a blend of various types of warfare that had long existed. Thus, it was neither a new term nor a replacement of interstate conventional warfare. Hybrid warfare was an add-on to the existing warfare that could be used by states. He added that the term hybrid warfare was a useful term to highlight or draw out certain characteristics of contemporary warfare. These characteristics included the trans-cultural aspects and the strategic ethnocentrism of hybrid warfare.

When looking at the centre of gravity, there was a concept of direct war and decisive victory. There were two strategies in direct war to achieve victory. While the first was going straight out to destroy the enemy's military, the second was to bleed out the enemy. Assoc Prof Hashim highlighted that hybrid warfare could be

applied in indirect war, where the definition of victory was different for each parties. Hence, war became asymmetric. For the smaller power, the theory of victory was to deny the enemy its theory of victory. If Iran and the United States went to war, Iran would deny the United States' theory of victory as it had no conception of decisive victory against the United States. If Iran survived, that was a victory for them. After the first Gulf War, Saddam Hussein viewed the war as his victory despite losing 70 percent of his army, because he survived and denied his adversary its victory of deposing him. In short, the lesson was to not fight on the terms of the larger power.

Hybrid warfare could be described as something heterogeneous and multi-shaped or multi-varied. In other words, hybrid warfare allowed the application of various capabilities tailored to suit the enemy's capabilities, environment and training. It was a cocktail of conventional military capabilities, insurgencies, terrorism, and guerrilla warfare. It could move up and down the spectrum of conflict depending on capabilities. For non-state actors, the spectrum of capabilities might be limited and as such, it would expand on the level within its limits. For states, it was a way to achieve an objective without direct war. It was a shift from the normal state of affairs to a situation of war. The use of hybrid warfare might violate international laws of war, and often included non-state actors and organisations. Hybrid warfare could also be used before, simultaneously or in place of conventional operations.

Assoc Prof Hashim highlighted the implications and potential destruction of hybrid warfare. The case of Ukraine demonstrated that hybrid warfare was not limited to weaker powers. Russia, as a stronger power, used hybrid warfare in place of an all-out war as an attempt to minimise negative perceptions amongst the international community. Non-state actors took a longer time to build hybrid warfare capabilities, unlike states that already had an array of pre-existing capabilities. In order for non-state actors to develop strong capabilities, the non-state actor had to be strongly socially embedded in the society in which they claimed to represent. Hybrid warfare involved multi-layer efforts designed to destabilise a functioning state and polarise society, and flexibility in the use of means and methods. It consciously blurred the lines between peace and war, and challenged international norms and order. An example would be the notion that international law was something imposed by the West.

Re-defining Armed Forces in Non-kinetic Operations

Dr Steven Metz
Director of Research, Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College
United States of America

Dr Steven Metz began by asking if the traditional notions of the military profession, ethics, and its associated organisations would still work in a changing security environment. If not, what needed to be sustained and kept in the military profession, and what needed to change.

Dr Metz explained that for most of human history, being a warrior was not a profession. It was something that was ascribed. In the tribal society, being male was to be a warrior. As societies developed, being a fighter became being a member of the elite. About four to five hundred years ago, the idea of the military as a chosen profession emerged, with certain rules and regulations arising subsequently. By profession, Dr Metz said that there was a unique body of knowledge of what a professional was expected to master, certain standards to define who could or could not enter the profession, a code of professional ethics and conduct, as well as an organisation that presided what the standards were.

This military profession model developed over the last four to five hundred years saw the development of entry standards. Intellectual, moral and physical aspects were identified as entry requirements of military professionals to meet the needs of industrial warfare. The changing security environment, in turn, roused the question if physical requirements were still a relevant standard for the military profession. The tradition of the military profession was one of hierarchy, divided into commissioned and non-commissioned officers. When it first emerged, it reflected the social division of the society four to five hundred years ago, but remained relevant today. The military profession was expected to adhere to society's highest ethical standards. Today, the military had been boosted by civil servants and contractors. There were debates to differentiate what kind of jobs could only be done by someone in uniform, or a civil servant or a contractor.

However, Dr Metz argued that the industrial warfare model of profession was no longer adequate for the current security environment, where the distinction

between military and non-military security was being blurred. The definition of security has been changing. In the past, national security meant a nation could be invaded or was vulnerable to military threats. In the current day, security not only had a military dimension, but also other dimensions, such as psychological, health, access to infrastructure, and the human dimension. Dr Metz also believed that the traditional way of thinking about operational security might be becoming obsolete. Military professionals might need different skills and mindsets to deal with the increased complexity and non-linear effects of warfare. Some of these skill sets included psychological acuity to think in terms of psychological effects, how to frame an operation so that it has the psychological effects desired; cross-cultural empathy, the ability to grasp and understand other cultures; mental adaptability, the ability to take new technology and inherently grasp it; and increasing risk tolerance at lower levels to make autonomous decisions.

In order to gain insights of what military professionals of the future should be like, Dr Metz suggested examining innovative private companies such as Google and Amazon. This meant that the military would continuously compete with the private sector for talent. He went on to question the relevance of having hierarchy, moral and intellectual requirements for entering into the military profession.

Dr Metz described the world thirty to fifty years down the road, where artificial intelligence, robotics, vast improvement of virtual reality, and human enhancements of many kinds would be part of human life. We would need to rethink what it meant to be human, what could be real, and what was engineered. What would it mean to be a military professional when most fighting was done by robots, androids or avatars rather than in person? What would it mean when machines and humans became partners in war fighting, rather than machines as human support? What would be the military ethics when most of the fighters machines instead of humans? What would it mean for the nature of the profession if we moved towards an era of robotics and virtual reality?

Dr Metz concluded by stating that we were at a point where there could be a need to rethink the operation and profession of the industrial-age military. The changing security environment would force us to think about what needs to be kept and changed about today's professional military ethics.

Social Media in Contemporary Operations (ISIS case study)

Dr Shashi Jayakumar
Head, Centre of Excellence for National Security (CENS), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Dr Shashi Jayakumar began by screening an Al-Qaeda video from 2005 which featured a member of Al-Qaeda behind the London 7/7 bombing, justifying the organisation's violent actions. That video was the height of Al-Qaeda's media sophistication, where a bombing happened and a video testament to explain the act was released. During that time, it was advanced in terms of video technology and media technology, although it might seem amateurish now. Since the advent of Facebook, YouTube and Twitter in 2004, 2005 and 2006 respectively, the media sphere had changed. Today, Dr Jayakumar argued that Islamic State (IS) was much more sophisticated than Al-Qaeda ever was.

Since 2014, the IS launched a multi-lingual campaign aimed to maximise its global reach. According to Dr Jayakumar, IS considered media warfare as equally important as military warfare to a point that it was essential for their activities. IS has been coordinating all its official propaganda publications through its media communication organisation, Al Hayat, which was launched in 2014, shortly before IS took over Mosul and declare its Caliphate. It was one of the most important groups in media terms for IS. Al Hayat was responsible for IS multi-lingual magazine Dabiq, which was skilfully produced with high-tech equipment, and tools in the field of media.

Dr Jayakumar characterised the IS's media strategy as one that aimed directly at its target demographic. Although IS had published its printed materials in various languages, it lacked an Arabic version until recently. This showed that the IS had focused on communicating to those outside the Middle East, so as to get people to join their Caliphate and become foreign fighters. The local officers on the ground would get their cues from the main centre, but they also had room to create location-specific content to more effectively communicate with the local target demographic.

IS's media approach was very stylised and glossy, including sophisticated graphics. The initial belief for this approach was that these graphics were trailers to IS-developed first-person shooter games that ran on the Islamic State's narrative. Although it was unclear if the games were ever launched, the imagery and metaphors were nonetheless very important in reaching out to specific

demographics for recruitment. The potential targets were identified as outcasts from society. A central theme in Islamic State's propaganda was the normalcy of life in the Caliphate that included images of members of Islamic State posing with cats and well equipped hospitals. This was done to attract followers to make the journey.

Dr Jayakumar pointed out that the communication of IS messages was not limited to the media. It extended to the education of the younger generation, such as a Jihadist kindergarten. He further pointed out that some of the messages of IS were not sent by members of IS, but rather by their sympathisers. He named a few of these sympathisers and stated that these sympathisers were careful to work just below the threshold of the law.

In the area of technological capabilities of the IS, Dr Jayakumar mentioned that IS did not possess hacking capabilities comparable to state-sponsored hacking. However, he added that social media platforms were advancing their capabilities in identifying and disabling accounts related to violent political groups. As such, tracking these groups' social media messages had become difficult. The application of social media by such groups also constantly changed, adapting to the limitations imposed. Dr Jayakumar added that these groups were very effective with "face-to-face" interaction on a variety of online forums. Any question or doubts about making the journey to the Caliphate could easily be answered on these.

Dr Jayakumar ended off by stating that through analysis of IS media targeting, Southeast Asia was clearly a region of interest for the Islamic State. As such, the region would likely face a blowback of fighters to Southeast Asia in the near future.

Panel 3: Questions and Answers Section

A participant asked about the responsibilities of armed agencies and the state, given the current context of conflicts where there was a blurring between civil and military. Dr Metz responded that military leaders had the responsibility to continuously question the way the military was organised and its basic assumptions, and to be able to communicate to civilian leaders the changes needed as the environment evolved.

The next question was about where does the military's ethical conduct lie in hybrid warfare. Assoc Prof Hashim commented that the military profession should not loosen military ethics in order to fight hybrid actors, be it state or non-state actors. It would be a static view of hybrid warfare to say that there could not be any allowance to international humanitarian law for hybrid warfare. Dr Metz questioned

what the ethical conduct was, given that in hybrid warfare there were malicious actors and privateers whose goals aligned with and benefited the state's interest, but was not under the same legal discipline as the state. Then what kind of relationship would the government have with this group of people?

Another participant asked about the implications for officer education given the complexity of the security environment, especially with social media and the speed at which it changed warfare. Dr Metz responded that the implications were the continuous question if it was necessary for the formalisation of military education system. There was a need to go beyond role-playing and let military students get used to communicating with people who thought otherwise about the military. Assoc Prof Hashim added that the problem with institutional red teaming was that although organisers encouraged thinking out of the box, they set a limit as to how far out of the box. There needed to be a deepening of multi-disciplinary education and cultural training. Dr Jayakumar commented that social media operations were aimed at affecting the media space and went beyond propaganda. What kind of timeline do we envisage for media operations? For the military, does the psychological effect of the media come under its responsibility? Dr Jayakumar suggested that getting a community of practitioners from various sections of media and public relations was important towards the understanding of media operations and the adversary.

The final question was on the legitimacy to respond with kinetic force towards a non-kinetic attack, and if there would be any international convention to regulate cyber-security. Dr Jayakumar suggested that maybe it was time to rethink how to respond to advanced technological attacks. Instead of putting regulations on drones swarming, it might be better to let swarms of drones fight each other. In addressing the second part of the question, he said that there was the Tallinn Manual aimed at addressing the use of cyber-attacks, although it was not binding.

PANEL 4: OPERATIONS INVOLVING MULTIPLE STAKEHOLDERS

The Centre of Gravity in Conventional and Unconventional Hybrid Warfare

Associate Professor Bhubhindar Singh
Coordinator of the Regional Security Architecture Programme, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Associate Professor Bhubhindar Singh began by discussing how defence diplomacy became an important part of the region's regional security architecture. The region has increasingly witnessed a lot more effort to engage regional defence establishments. There was a clear trend when looking at the successes of ASEAN Defence Ministers Meeting (ADMM) and ADMM-Plus.

To set the context, Assoc Prof Singh defined the concept of defence diplomacy as the use of military establishments as a tool of foreign policy to promote the interest of a state, particularly during peacetime. If the current concept of defence diplomacy was compared to the period during the Cold War, there was a stark difference. During the Cold War, defence diplomacy meant cooperation with friends and allies, as well as strengthening and sustaining spheres of influence. However, in the current context, it involved cooperation with adversaries and potential adversaries during peacetime.

In light of today's complex security environment, Assoc Prof Singh said that defence diplomacy played an important role as no one state could solve its own problems alone. Furthermore, the role of the military had changed. The scope of military work now involved many forms of operations, as such Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) and Operations Other Than War (OOTW). Thus, Assoc Prof Singh mentioned that a multilateral approach was needed to deal with the complexity of the modern security environment. Focusing on ADMM and ADMM-Plus, he identified the promotion of strategic dialogue and practical cooperation between member states as objectives. In essence, ADMM and ADMM-Plus were formed to translate talk to action.

Assoc Prof Singh listed six strengths of ADMM and ADMM-Plus. First, ADMM and ADMM-Plus offered defence ministers and officials their own platforms for dialogue in a multilateral setting. This allowed them to contribute to and take ownership of debates. Second, ADMM-Plus included all the main players in East Asia security. Third, defence dialogue was divided into six expert work groups that covered

various aspects of security. For each working group, there would be two co-chairs where one would be an ASEAN state and the other from outside the association. The rationale for this arrangement was to ensure that any specific aspect was dealt with a state outside ASEAN for a holistic perspective on the issue. Fourth, the platforms were well received and had moved from a triennial to a biennial arrangement. It had also led to joint exercises that involved all 18 member states. Fifth, it had changed the mindset of states in the region about speaking in relation to defence issues in ASEAN. Finally, ASEAN states were convinced that they could cooperate to strengthen their own capabilities; familiarity with military training procedure; and strengthen inter-operability among various military establishments. Furthermore, ADMM-Plus offered great powers a neutral platform to engage with ASEAN.

Despite the strengths of ADMM and ADMM-Plus, Assoc Prof Singh also highlighted five challenges the two platforms faced. First was the inability to expand cooperation in traditional security. Second was the failure to translate cooperation during joint military exercises into regional standard operating procedures. An example was Typhoon Haiyan, where both ADMM and ADMM-Plus were unable to activate. Third, there was a distinct military capability gap among states. Fourth, there was a lack of synergy among states, as some of the proposals were not translated into action. Lastly, the evolving strategic landscape continued to present challenges for the two platforms.

Assoc Prof Singh concluded that ADMM and ADMM-Plus were key multilateral platforms in keeping the region stable and peaceful. The two platforms had their hits and misses, but it was crucial for us to invest effort in ensuring that these platforms remained important.

Civil-Military Relations: The Arne Spring Experience

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim
Associate Professor, Military Studies Programme, Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim began by identifying two types of revolutions. The first was the top-down revolution, wherein the military took over the government to prevent social uprising, and to ensure that the revolution followed the military's desired path. In such a revolution, the military would pledge to return the government to civilian rule once the military deemed that the situation was stable.

The transfer to civilian rule usually never happened, but the structure of military domination in government evolved over the decades. An example of this was in Egypt. The second was the bottom-up revolution where the masses were upset with the existing situation and with the perfect storm of political, social, socio-economic stresses, a revolution took place.

Focusing on the Arab Spring, Assoc Prof Hashim went on to outline the causes of the revolution. The first cause was the exhaustion of the Arab authoritarian state. The authoritarian states did not succeed in delivering on their post-colonial promises. The second cause was the socioeconomic crisis. On top of unhappiness with the corruption of the state, the 2008-2010 economic crises led to a drastic increase in food prices, which further escalated the unhappiness among the populace. The third cause was the cultural and psychological malaise over powerlessness that became the breeding ground for Al-Qaeda and the Islamic State. The masses felt that they had no control over their fate. The fourth cause was that due to military defeats and setbacks, the Arabs were unable to thrive and succeed in the region, and as a result had to look for better opportunities beyond.

Assoc Prof Hashim also touched on the enablers of the revolution. He emphasised that the media and the rise of information technology connectivity allowed for the flow of information. The security services were not able to control it due to their inability to think out of the box. The Arab security services were set up to conduct surveillance and to protect the regime through oppression of the people violently. However, when media started playing a role in the revolution, they were unprepared.

Assoc Prof Hashim briefly summarised the context and the revolution of various countries in the Middle East. Tunisia was one of the most secular Arab states with one of the highest literacy rates. It was dominated by the police service as it had a higher police-to-military ratio. When the revolution happened, the military that had no familiar or privileged links to the regime, told the leader of the regime that it was wrong to shoot civilians and gave him three hours to leave. The military tried to create a cordon to protect the civilians, and shot back at the paramilitary units that were shooting at civilians. In Egypt, the situation was more complex. The military dominated, but when the military stepped in, it was to protect the continuation of the existing system. In Libya, there the Praetorian Guard that supported Gaddafi and the regular army filtered to the opposition. Although the Praetorian Guard was better armed, foreign intervention tipped the balance towards the opposition. As such, foreign intervention was important in determining if the revolution would succeed. In Syria, the army remained intact with the help of proxy forces. In Yemen, there were two militaries. When one turned against the regime during the revolution, it tipped the scale against the regime.

In conclusion, Assoc Prof Hashim explained that if a regular military establishment was not linked organically to the regime, the military would not defend it when there was serious internal political violence. On the other hand, privately or ethnically-linked military would defend the regime but only to protect their own interests. Lastly, minority regimes that were fighting for their life were harder to overthrow. These regimes knew they would be killed once overthrown, thus they would go down fighting hard.

Nepal Earthquake Case Study

Colonel Lim Kwang Tang
Former Deputy Chief Guards Officer, and Director of Changi Regional HADR Co-ordination Centre (RHCC)
Singapore

Colonel Lim Kwang Tang began with a common question on how Singapore, as a small country, could make such a significant contribution in comparison to larger countries that could offer more resources. In answering, COL Lim highlighted the synergy of Singapore's whole-of-government approach, which included the meaningful contribution of the Ministry of Health, Singapore Civil Defence force, and Singapore Armed Forces. He explained that each agency came in with their respective specialised areas, and collectively had the ability to adapt to the ground. Furthermore, Singapore filled a niche area by providing a common operating picture and information, with the support of information technology back home. As a result, Singapore's disaster relief contingent was able to bring services beyond the allocated location.

There were also certain challenges faced during the relief efforts at Nepal. COL Lim shared a story whereby he was misheard by a civilian medical team that they would be put up at "Sheraton," when he was really saying that they would "Share a tent." The story highlighted civil-military differences in expectations and adaptability to the situation. Another challenge that COL Lim highlighted was in relation to command and control on the ground. The channel of communication and authority could be complex among various aid contingents and the host country. Lastly, there were cultural differences that any foreign aid contingent would have to be sensitive towards.

Next, COL Lim used the analogy of selecting how to give a piece of candy to a group of children to describe the challenge of aid distribution. He said that although it might seem natural to give the candy to the smallest child, the consequence would be upsetting for the older children because they did not receive the candy.

This illustrated the kind of sensitivity and consideration required when carrying out a task. Similarly, efficient distribution of aid materials could cause conflict as aid materials would not reach everyone at the same time, and those who had not received the aid material would start worrying if there was enough to go around. Thus, if there was not enough aid material to distribute, COL Lim opined that aid workers should not distribute.

On the matter of making difficult decisions on the ground, COL Lim shared his dilemma when he had to end the mission. The mission was half-a-day short to the 14-day requirement required to receive an overseas mission medal. However, COL Lim made the hard decision to withdraw as the mission objective was already met. On hindsight, COL Lim explained that he was happy that he made that hard decision as one day after the contingent withdrew, a second quake struck their previous location. If the contingent had stayed another day, they would have been trapped with no resources.

In his concluding remarks, COL Lim maintained that the Singapore contingent acted professionally and was well trained for the task. The contingent was mission-focused, and went beyond the call of duty to strive for excellence. Based on his experience as mission commander, COL Lim's final advice for the officers was to learn to make difficult decisions in the face of complexity.

Panel 4: Questions and Answers Section

A question was raised about fostering cultural empathy and if it would be a useful avenue for maintaining regional peace and stability. Assoc Prof Singh commented that there was extremely little reference to culture in concept papers, and in military exercises, culture played a very small role. He added that multilateral platforms were more about building trust, confidence and promoting interaction between states; nevertheless, culture was important in understanding a country's perception.

The next question was regarding the lessons Southeast Asia and Singapore could draw from civil-military relations during the Arab spring. Assoc Prof Hashim answered that the transition from military government to democracy had been less violent elsewhere than in the Arab world. In the Arab world, the transition to democracy had been stalled and regressed into successive coup-making. The transition from authoritarian to democracy had been better managed in this part of the world than in the Middle East. However, there was no definite explanation as to the cause.

PLENARY PRESENTATIONS

The first group presented on how conventional armed forces of the Asia Pacific region could respond to the challenges of the complex security landscape. The complexity of the security landscape was defined by the group as issues that overlapped conventional and unconventional threats. In particular, there was an issue of whether Singapore would be able to respond using its armed forces when faced with threats that threatened national security but did not cause casualties. Social media also posed various challenges that could generate a "fog of war." In light of the above, the group proposed the whole-of-government approach to tackle the complexity of the security landscape ahead. Focusing on the role of the military, the group believed that the military could help to build trust among states and to navigate through the security landscape ahead.

The second group presented on two areas: (i) how conventional armed forces could respond to the challenges of a complex security landscape; and (ii) what are some smart power strategies that armed forces could utilise. The group first identified what were the elements that made the security landscape complex. Elements that were suggested included ideology, social, religion, political, and disruptive technology. Although the military alone would not be able to address all these aspects, it could provide the security environment required for other instruments to take effect. On the topic of smart power, the group found that it was contextual. The goal was to find an optimal blend of hard and soft power, giving hard power a soft edge and soft power a softer edge. Specifically for the military, it was about portraying the operation as a contribution towards the common international community's cause.

The third group presented on the skill-sets needed in the face of non-kinetic operations and the challenges of defence diplomacy and cooperation. The group defined non-kinetic operations as the existing unconventional part of existing conventional warfare. Technological and geopolitical pushing were the drivers that highlighted the unconventional side of conventional warfare. The group proposed to tackle the problem through adapting institutions and training soldiers in decision-making at the individual level to meet challenges of non-kinetic operations. The group identified cultural sensitivity, flexibility, adaptability and versatility as important traits required to tackle the challenges of defence diplomacy and cooperation.

Colonel Ng Wai Kit, Commandant, GKS CSC, delivering the closing remarks

Rear Admiral Giam Hock Koon began by reinforcing the mission statement of MINDEF/SAF, and highlighted that, regardless of peacetime or wartime, the armed forces had a part to play in the diplomacy, deterrence, and the military defence of Singapore. In order to enhance security, the MINDEF and SAF had a part to play irrespective of the security issue domain. On the topic of smart power, RADM Giam described it as a strategy whereby if you were good at it, others would not know it had been applied. On top of being clear of our own national interests, the key lay in cooperating with others' national interests and accommodating new interests if they arose. On the topic of National Serviceman (NS men), RADM Giam highlighted that NS men complained because they cared. They were of great value to SAF as they came with experience from areas outside the military, and could provide unorthodox views to a situation.

Colonel Ng Wai Kit first touched on the topic of warfare. He defined warfare as a state of conflict between two parties, while war-craft was the art of fighting. In the same vein, state-fare was the whole-of-government approach. In order for statecraft to work, there needed to be an understanding of the mechanics of state-fare to effectively apply soft power.

Next COL Ng recapped the butterfly effect, where a small stimulus could lead to a big effect. He added that there was a need to recognise that as warfare became increasingly non-linear, the cause would be non-traceable. According to COL Ng, the current security problem was a wicked problem. The concept of winning was less clear and there was no definite answer. To conclude, COL Ng left the participants with two questions. First, what was the black elephant of SAF? Second, what was the black elephant of individuals in their personal professional life?

SEMINAR PROGRAMME

Day 1

6 October 2016 (Thursday)

0900 hrs   **Opening Remarks**
Rear Admiral Giam Hock Koon
Commandant, SAFTI Military Institute
Singapore Armed Forces

0910 hrs   **Keynote Address**
Mr Peter Ho
Senior Advisor, Centre for Strategic Futures
Singapore

1010 hrs   **Keynote Speech**
Professor Ralf Emmers
Associate Dean, RSIS
Singapore

1020 hrs   **Coffee Break**

1100 hrs   **Panel 1: The Changing Character of Conflict**

Speakers:
Dr Collin Koh
Research Fellow, Maritime Security Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Group Captain Dennis Tan
Course Director and Director of Studies Air Force,
Australian Command and Staff College
Australian Defence Force

Dr Wu Shang-Su
Research Fellow, Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Chairperson:
Mr Eddie Lim
Senior Fellow and Coordinator of Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

SEMINAR PROGRAMME

1230 hrs **Lunch**

1330 hrs **Panel 2: Integrating Hard and Soft Power**

Speakers:
Assistant Professor Evan Resnick
Coordinator of the U.S. Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Colonel Yang Si Cheng
Director (Information Directorate), MINDEF Communications Organisation
Singapore

Professor Tomonori Yoshizaki
Director of Policy Simulation, National Institute for Defense Studies
Japan

Chairperson:
Assistant Professor Ong Wei Chong
Assistant Professor, Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

1500 hrs **Coffee Break**

1530 hrs **Syndicate Discussions**

Day 2
7 October 2016 (Friday)

0900 hrs   **Panel 3: Kinetic and Non-Kinetic Means in Operations**

Speakers:
Associate Professor Bhubhindar Singh
Coordinator of the Regional Security Architecture Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim
Associate Professor, Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Colonel Lim Kwang Tang
Former Deputy Chief Guards Officer and Director of
Changi Regional HADR Co-ordination Centre (RHCC)
Singapore

Chairperson:
Assistant Professor Daniel Chua
Deputy Head of Graduate Studies; Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

1130 hrs   **Lunch**

1330 hrs   **Syndicate Discussion**

1500 hrs   **Coffee Break**

Speakers:
Mr Eddie Lim
Senior Fellow and Coordinator of the Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

1645 hrs   **Closing Remarks**

Colonel Ng Wai Kit
Commandant, Goh Keng Swee Command and Staff College (GKS CSC)
Singapore Armed Forces

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim
Associate Professor, Military Studies Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Dr Shashi Jayakumar
Head, Centre of Excellence for National Security (CENS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Dr Collin Koh
Research Fellow, Maritime Security Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Colonel Lim Kwang Tang
Former Deputy Chief Guards Officer; and
Director of Changi Regional HADR Co-ordination Centre (RHCC)
Singapore

Dr Steven Metz
Director of Research, Strategic Studies Institute
US Army War College
United States of America

Assistant Professor Evan Resnick
Coordinator of the U.S. Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Associate Professor Bhubhindar Singh
Coordinator of the Regional Security Architecture Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Group Captain Dennis Tan
Course Director and Director of Studies Air Force
Australian Command and Staff College
Australian Defence Force

Dr Wu Shang-Su
Research Fellow, Military Studies Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Colonel Yang Si Cheng
Director (Information Directorate)
MINDEF Communications Organisation
Singapore

Professor Tomonori Yoshizaki
Director of Policy Simulation, National Institute for Defense Studies
Japan

LIST OF CHAIRPERSONS

Assistant Professor Daniel Chua
Deputy Head of Graduate Studies; and Military Studies Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Mr Eddie Lim
Senior Fellow and Coordinator of the Military Studies Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Assistant Professor Ong Wei Chong
Assistant Professor, Military Studies Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

Dr Graham Ong-Webb
Research Fellow, Military Studies Programme
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS)
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)
Singapore

About the Goh Keng Swee Command and Staff College

The Goh Keng Swee Command and Staff College (GKS CSC) is the Singapore Armed Forces' premier educational institution. All SAF's leaders pass through the portals of GKS CSC.

Each year, specially selected officers attend the various courses offered at GKS CSC. Through the GKS CSC's course curriculum and extra curricula activities, these officers acquire the requisite exposure to the complexities and challenges of leading the SAF into the future.

GKS CSC is proud to be one of three schools within SAFTI Military Institute, the other two being the Officer Cadet School (OCS) and the SAF Advanced Schools (SAS). Together, these schools provide holistic officer education and training for regular and National Service Full-Time officers of the Singapore Armed Forces.

About the SAF-NTU Academy

The SAF-NTU Academy (SNA)'s mission is to create and sustain the academic capacity and knowledge needed to equip military leaders with professional military knowledge using multidisciplinary approaches. The programme managed by SNA will contribute to the SAF's overall nurturing and engagement efforts to develop competent and committed military professionals. SNA is also charged with growing a pool of deep specialists skilled in both military and academic disciplines.
SNA oversees the SAF-NTU Continuing Education (CE) Master's and the SAF-NTU Undergraduate Professional Military Education and Training (UGPMET) programmes. SNA works closely with the SAF Education Office and Goh Keng Swee Command and Staff College at the SAFTI Military Institute and SAF Personnel Management Centres in the execution of its programmes.
Other than delivering education, SNA manages research, scholarship and collaboration programmes to ensure the renewal, creation and management of knowledge for educational purposes, and to raise the professional and academic standing of both the SAF and NTU.

About the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies

The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) is a professional graduate school of international affairs at the Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. RSIS' mission is to develop a community of scholars and policy analysts at the forefront of security studies and international affairs. Its core functions are research, graduate education and networking. It produces cutting-edge research on Asia Pacific Security, Multilateralism and Regionalism, Conflict Studies, Non-Traditional Security, International Political Economy, and Country and Region Studies. RSIS' activities are aimed at assisting policymakers to develop comprehensive approaches to strategic thinking on issues related to security and stability in the Asia Pacific.

For more information, please visit www.rsis.edu.sg.

RSiS

Nanyang Technological University

S. RAJARATNAM
SCHOOL OF
INTERNATIONAL
STUDIES