

18TH ASIA PACIFIC PROGRAMME FOR SENIOR MILITARY OFFICERS (APPSMO)

HYBRID WARFARE AND THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY: CHALLENGES AND IMPLICATIONS

Event Report
5-10 August 2016

The Institute of Defence
and Strategic Studies

Event Report

18TH ASIA PACIFIC PROGRAMME FOR SENIOR MILITARY OFFICERS (APPSMO)

HYBRID WARFARE AND THE ROLE OF THE MILITARY: CHALLENGES AND IMPLICATIONS

Organised by:
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS),
S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS),
Nanyang Technological University (NTU),
Singapore

5-10 August 2016
Village Hotel Changi, Singapore

Editor
Nah Liang Tuang

Rapporteurs
Ho Shu Huang, Eugene Mark Min Hui, Andre Foo Yong-De, Henrik Robert Paulsson,
Ng Chew Yee and Hannah Goh

This report summarises the proceedings of the conference as interpreted by assigned rapporteurs and editor of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. Participants neither reviewed nor approved this report.

The conference adheres to a variation of the Chatham House Rule. Accordingly, beyond the points expressed in the prepared papers, no attributions have been included in this conference report.

Terms of use

This publication may be reproduced electronically or in print, and used in discussions on radio, television or fora, with prior written permission obtained from RSIS and due credit given to the author(s) and RSIS. Please email RSISPublications@ntu.edu.sg for further editorial queries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of APPSMO 2016	5
Welcome Remarks	6
Scene-setting Lecture	7
Scene-setting Roundtable	11
Keynote Address	17
Luncheon Conversation	19
Distinguished Dinner Lecture	21
Session I: Dimensions of war and strategy	25
Session II: Hybrid threats and the future of warfare	29
Session III: Information and cyber warfare: The military dimension	32
Session IV: Civilian-military relations and a whole-of-government approach towards security	36
Closing Roundtable: New threats and challenges in the Asia Pacific	41
Conference Programme	45
Speakers, Chairpersons and Participants	54
About the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies	65
About the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies	65

SUMMARY OF APPSMO 2016

The 18th Asia Pacific Programme for Senior Military Officers (APPSMO) organised by the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS), was held at Village Hotel Changi in Singapore from 4 to 10 August 2016. Since its inception in 1999, APPSMO has provided a unique and important forum for military officers and defence analysts to network and exchange views on a broad range of subjects related to regional and international security. APPSMO 2016 continued to facilitate defence diplomacy with the attendance of 53 military officers and defence planners from 24 countries representing Asia, Oceania, North America and Europe.

During the week-long programme, the participants attended a series of seminars and discussions that featured experts from both the academic and policy communities. The theme for APPSMO 2016 was “Hybrid Warfare and the Role of the Military: Challenges and Implications”. Some of the key topics discussed included the dimensions of war and strategy, hybrid threats and the future of warfare, information and cyber warfare, warfare and civilisation, power transition in the Asia Pacific, civil-military relations, and the whole-of-government approach towards security.

The participants visited the Regional HADR Coordination Centre (RHCC) at the Changi Naval Base, as well as the Port of Singapore Authority (PSA). They were also brought on a heritage tour of Changi, visited the Battlebox, and given a tour of Changi Airport’s operations. The participants and speakers attended the National Day Parade on 9 August 2016. APPSMO 2016 has played an important role as an additional conduit of defence diplomacy by facilitating interaction among senior military officers in and beyond the Asia Pacific. It has provided an opportunity for participants to foster a better understanding of each other, as well as their respective countries.

WELCOME REMARKS



Ambassador Ong Keng Yong
*Executive Deputy Chairman, RSIS; and
Director, Institute of Defence and Strategic
Studies
Singapore*

Ambassador Ong Keng Yong welcomed participants, speakers and guests to the 18th APPSMO. He began with a short introduction of Changi, observing that it was an appropriate venue for senior military officers to meet given the area's significant military history. He followed with a short history of RSIS, which began as IDSS in 1996, noting that this year was the School's 20th anniversary.

Moving onto the conference's theme, "Hybrid Warfare and the Role of the Military: Challenges and Implications," Amb Ong pointed out that hybrid warfare, as compact a term as it is, comprises a complex mix of pressing issues worth discussing. All of the week's speakers, Amb Ong highlighted, would explore these various issues in the coming days.

In closing, Amb Ong thanked MINDEF and other government ministries for their continuous support of APPSMO over the past 18 years. He hoped APPSMO would continue growing from strength to strength, with more countries and organisations participating in future iterations.

SCENE-SETTING LECTURE



Ambassador Bilahari Kausikan
*Ambassador-at-Large and Policy Adviser,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Singapore*

Ambassador Bilahari Kausikan thanked Ambassador Ong for the warm introduction, as well as the opportunity to speak at this year's APPSMO. He noted he would not deliver a formal lecture, but instead share a few ideas he had about the region in three main areas – (i) U.S.-China relations; (ii) domestic developments in each country; and (iii) the influence the Middle East has on Southeast Asia.

Amb Kausikan began with the search by the U.S. and China for a new *modus vivendi* in their relations with each other and other countries in the region. He noted that the relations between the two powers would invariably affect Southeast Asia, with the catalyst being China's rise, which the U.S. facilitated. Amb Kausikan observed that the U.S. wants to maintain its traditional dominance in the region, but maintaining this status quo is now impossible, even if it is politically difficult to admit.

Having noted this, Amb Kausikan stressed that the U.S. is not in decline, despite the impression the dysfunctionality of U.S. politics as portrayed in the media gives. He posited that what happens in Washington D.C. does not characterise the state of the whole of the U.S. Rather, it is what happens in individual states, businesses and universities, which arguably matters more. There, U.S. creativity still dominates, and with it, American global influence.

As such, Amb Kausikan concluded that the existing regional order needs to be supplemented, not changed. Although he observed post-WWII Asia was largely an American construct, its establishment largely facilitated by American generosity in opening its markets to the region then, the regional order is presently dynamic with no *de facto* leader. What exactly the new arrangements will be is yet unknown. Various experiments are

ongoing, but their outcomes remain to be seen. Amb Kausikan wondered if perhaps the outcome is less important than the process, where there would be an effort to establish overlapping frameworks of order, reflecting the region's complexity.

Amb Kausikan then described the state of play between both powers by exploring what the U.S. and China each wanted. The U.S. wants to retain dominance, yet it can no longer, but is unsure what can be given up. He described the U.S. as groping its way forward. China, on the other hand, is not a revisionist power. It has worked largely within the existing order. Amb Kausikan cited the example of China's use of the World Trade Organization (WTO) dispute settlement mechanism. China has abided by the decisions, even if it lost. That noted, Amb Kausikan observed China wants to regain something of its historical centrality in East Asia. Yet how much, and how much is possible, remains unclear.

More importantly, Amb Kausikan stressed China does not have the capacity or interest to displace the U.S. and his rationale was simple. Without the U.S. in the region, Japan may go nuclear and South Korea would follow. He noted that there are already voices in both countries musing aloud whether they should be nuclear powers, with North Korea as a convenient excuse. Amb Kausikan also noted Japan and South Korea might be nudged further in that direction as it would only be a matter time for North Korea to develop a second strike capability, and that the Obama Administration was considering a no-first-use doctrine. Extended deterrence would then end. Amb Kausikan concluded that if the U.S. decreased its presence in the region, and Japan and South Korea consequently went nuclear, the region will be left in a strategic situation no one wants.

However, Amb Kausikan was optimistic that no country wants war. He argued that the oft-cited Thucydides Trap that points to the risk of war in the region does not pay sufficient attention to human agency. Amb Kausikan opined countries, especially China despite its tough talk, are not reckless. He observed that direct confrontation leading to war would threaten the preservation of Chinese Communist Party rule that Beijing would not allow. Instead, the South China Sea has become a proxy issue where confrontation plays out as a ritualised competition with loud voices, but no truly reckless actions, from either side.

The second area of Amb Kausikan's lecture was on the structural dysfunctionalities in the internal politics of the U.S. and China. He wondered aloud who would be the next U.S. President, admitting that his confidence in understanding U.S. elections has been shaken given how Presidential campaigning has progressed this year. Amb Kausikan suggested that Hilary Clinton as president would mean continued consistency, whereas Donald Trump would spell unpredictability. He, however, paid more attention to the reasons for the current state of affairs, rather than the outcome. Amb Kausikan observed that its source were contradictory impulses. Although benefiting from it, American society feels it has been victimised by globalisation and now has a bad deal. He concluded that regardless of who becomes President, this dissatisfaction has to be addressed. More importantly, President Barack Obama was regarded as a weak and unassertive president in his second term. Amb Kausikan pointed out the new President has to be seen as being stronger.

Turning his attention to China, Amb Kausikan observed that stability within China is in everybody's interest. China, he pointed out, has many internal problems but this is not uncommon as Indonesia and Thailand have problems too. Amb Kausikan argued that what is needed is a strong government to tackle them, and the Chinese Communist Party has proven to be very adaptable in addressing them. He highlighted that the 19th National Congress of the CCP would be held next year, and President Xi Jinping will try to fill empty seats with his people in an attempt to consolidate his power. There would be several implications to this. The protection of China's sovereignty has been the foundation of CCP rule, with it needing to appear strong and in control in the face of competition. A useful tool has been nationalism, but this has raised regional tensions. Amb Kausikan wondered if President Xi, assuming successful power consolidation, would be able to dial it down. He also noted that many want to see China develop into a multi-party system. This, he argued, was dangerous due to existing nationalist fervour.

The final section of Amb Kausikan's lecture focused on the influence of the Middle East on the region. He noted that there was a clear Arabisation of Islam in Southeast Asia. In this regard, globalisation has been bad. Amb Kausikan argued that Islam here used to be inclusive, but has become increasingly more exclusive because of Middle Eastern

influence. This in turn has changed the texture of Muslim societies, and thus politics. He observed stark changes in Malaysia, and to a lesser degree, Indonesia. He suggested that there is presently a strong anti-Western element in Muslim identity that the current non-anti-Western governments of Indonesia, Malaysia and Brunei can cope with. Yet Amb Kausikan wondered if this could be sustained beyond the current leadership. He pointed out that no government can sustain a huge gap in beliefs between leaders and their people.

Relating this section back to the previous one, Amb Kausikan explored the role the Middle East would play in U.S.-China relations. He highlighted the wars the U.S. fought in the Middle East as being the longest in U.S. history, and have yet to be resolved. This has been an enormous distraction to the U.S. for over a decade, resulting in it being less active in Asia than it historically had been. The so-called U.S. pivot, Amb Kausikan pointed out, is merely an attempt to return to this norm. More significantly, U.S. Middle Eastern involvement has prevented it from taking a harder line against China. He cited anecdotes shared by a Chinese scholar who observed that the invasion of Kuwait in 1990 distracted the U.S. from taking a firmer stance against China following the Tiananmen crackdown, as did 9/11 following President George W. Bush's identification of China as a key strategic competitor in the early 2000s. Amb Kausikan concluded that the Middle East will continue to distract the U.S. as the region has a way of imposing itself on even those who want to ignore it. He noted China wishes to be more involved in the Middle East, but urged caution in what it wishes for as it is unclear if China's involvement in the turbulent region would be a stabilising or destabilising force.

In conclusion, Amb Kausikan noted military planners must plan for worst case scenarios. Yet he pointed out that these scenarios are not very helpful in understanding day-to-day challenges as worst case scenarios were unlikely, thereby limiting the usefulness of such a pessimistic mind-set if it dominated policymaking. Amb Kausikan argued that the dynamic of U.S.-China relations is essentially stabilising despite a broad range of issues they each face. He was confident that the key issues will eventually be distilled and brought to the centre for focused resolution. Amb Kausikan ended his lecture with the hope that the region would on the whole, remain peaceful.

SCENE-SETTING ROUNDTABLE

Geopolitics and trends in the Asia Pacific



(L-R) Mr Alexander Gabuev, Vice-Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda, Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain, and Professor Joseph Liow

Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain, Senior Fellow, Delhi Policy Group; and Visiting Fellow, Vivekananda International Foundation, Republic of India; divided his presentation into three main areas, namely (i) global geopolitical trends; (ii) issues specific to the Asia Pacific; and (iii) other observations.

On the topic of global geopolitical trends, LTG Hasnain offered a picture of wide-ranging issues. He first described the decline of Europe where the European economy has not revitalised itself even as America has begun to recover. LTG Hasnain then described the U.S. rebalance and pivot to Asia, the rise of China, and the rise of so-called Middle Powers. This new strategic reality, he concluded, has resulted in a dynamic international world order. A New World Order dominated by a major power, as some have suggested, is nowhere on the horizon.

LTG Hasnain then zoomed in on the specific issues that have dominated present discussions. One that has endured over the past decade is the so-called Global War on Terror. LTG Hasnain observed that the focus of that war is no longer on its impact on the Middle East, but the broader impact the turbulence there has on Europe. Radicalism has radiated out of the region, and more than ever before, European liberalism is under

threat. LTG Hasnain cited the migration of refugees from conflict zones in the Middle East, and how terrorist organisations have caused, as well as exploited this phenomenon, is just one a manifestation of this. He noted that the melt-down of a particular nation now no longer affects just its neighbourhood, but the neighbouring regions as well, and eventually the entire world. To underscore his point, he showed a map of the world that illustrated, in terms of infrastructure and resources, that what happened in the Middle East could have far reaching effects on the rest of the world.

LTG Hasnain then moved on to his second section on Asia Pacific issues. He began by highlighting the significance of the Asia Pacific region. It now had a significant competitive edge, and was therefore an economic challenge to the West. This was fuelled by factors such as demography, the general absence of strife and consistent growth. The presence of major developed economic powers such as Japan, South Korea and Australia has also facilitated this dramatic growth. Additionally, as the Asia Pacific covers much of the world's trade routes, stability in the region also naturally dictates the state of international seaborne trade.

Having noted this, LTG Hasnain then pointed out the main drivers of security in the region, particularly those that might have a destabilising effect. He first described China's strategic and economic stardom in recent years that has co-existed, at times uneasily so, with the gradual but steady rise of other regional Middle Powers such as Japan, Australia and India. Collectively, the rise of these countries has resulted in attempts to change the post-WWII power structure that has been dominated by the U.S., which still wishes to remain politically, economically and militarily engaged in the Asia Pacific. Its value has been proven over the decades, yet it is clear the U.S. has to relinquish some of its dominance. LTG Hasnain noted that the ensuing friction caused by this renegotiation has not been without its unfortunate effects. He pointed to potential cracks within the Association of Southeast Asian Nation (ASEAN) over the South China Sea disputes because of the increasingly difficult and coercive security environment the region has now found itself in.

These drivers, LTG Hasnain observed, have resulted in new strategic realities. He opined that the political systems of Asia cannot be taken as cast in bronze. More worrisome is the possibility that proxy wars thus far

unheard of in Southeast and East Asia could surface. This, LTG Hasnain argued, is because of China's quest for economic security, and American desire to manage China's increase in military power, which could pose tough choices. Compounding this potential regional instability is the foreign threat of the Islamic State to Malaysia and Indonesia.

In his final section, LTG Hasnain asked several open-ended questions. First, he wondered if China would have the economic muscle to see ambitious projects such as the One Belt, One Road through. Next, he asked what type of empire—political, economic, or both—China wanted to build. Finally, he pondered if ASEAN could afford internal disagreements over issues involving China.

Drawing on his 40 years of experience, **Vice-Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda**, Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force, Japan, offered thinking points in two main areas, namely maritime, and ballistic missile regional developments. These two areas, he believed, would have a huge impact on regional geopolitics.

In his first section on regional maritime developments, VADM Koda began by highlighting how two major waterways in the world, the Panama and Suez Canals, had been expanded. This expansion has facilitated an increase in the volume of international trade, and would continue to power the global economy. Shipping routes through these waterways, however, while long established, are now facing competition from an emerging Arctic one. VADM Koda pointed out that new North Eastern shipping routes have been created because of melting polar ice caps, resulting in shortened shipping routes across the world, as well as new undersea resources. While intuitively a commercial issue, VADM Koda argued that the establishment of a new route as a replacement of established routes could have a strategic impact too. In particular, Russia has begun to become more active in the maritime domain, as has China. VADM Koda noted Russia has sought military bases in the Arctic, and China's icebreaker, the Xue Long, successfully staged an Arctic expedition, demonstrating the potential and capability to expand its naval presence in the Arctic Ocean.

Aside from creating a new viable shipping route that could cause strategic instability, VADM Koda noted global warming could result in

more natural disasters. The Pacific Islands, he cited, could disappear under rising sea levels, resulting in a flood of refugees. This human security issue, he argued, was presently under-explored. VADM Koda, however, acknowledged that the South China Sea disputes are presently foremost on the region's mind. He agreed with much of the concern that the militarisation of the area, particularly the reclamation of land to construct bases, could result in incidents between the U.S. and China.

Moving onto his second section on ballistic missile developments in the region, VADM Koda described these concerns as not new. China, he pointed out, has historically invested extensively in nuclear weapons, which remains a key pillar of its strategic deterrent. North Korea too has a history of missile tests. It presently only has medium-range missiles, but it is working towards missiles that can reach the continental U.S. VADM Koda observed that it is determined to do so and has allocated a lot of resources to realising this ambition, despite a starving population. In response to this, South Korea has introduced the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system supplied by the U.S., but VADM Koda pointed out that this sophisticated anti-missile defence system only protects the north of the country, and therefore is only a partial solution to South Korea's concern of a North Korean missile strike.

VADM Koda concluded by stressing that Japan will always be a staging area for U.S. involvement in Asia. Consequently, Japan will always be intimately involved in any American actions in the region, and as such, regional strategic developments will always be at the forefront of Japan's mind.

Mr Alexander Gabuev, Senior Associate and Chair, Russia in the Asia Pacific Program, Carnegie Moscow Centre, The Russian Federation, wrapped up the roundtable by reacting to the points Amb Bilahari had raised earlier. He responded in three areas, namely (i) the return to geopolitics; (ii) states may not be as stable as they appear; and (iii) radical Islam as a reaction to imperfect capitalism and globalisation.

In the first area, Mr Gabuev acknowledged Amb Bilahari's description that a state's objective interests is peace as right - no state centres war in its policymaking, and avoids conflict if possible. In a general sense, Mr Gabuev therefore agreed states are more interested in development.

Having noted that, Mr Gabuev pointed out that this was also true in Europe before WWI. He argued strong economic ties in the region were present then, yet war still broke out. Mr Gabuev concluded that ultimately, human agency is still of the utmost importance. Interpersonal relations are crucial in geopolitics. People ultimately make decisions.

Mr Gabuev was particularly concerned about this area. He observed that there is much distrust of each other amongst the senior leadership of the major powers. In Russia, Mr Gabuev observed, anti-Americanism was very visible in the top leadership. President Vladimir Putin, in particular, has a lot of influence. He argued that Putin, and therefore Russia, sees the U.S. as a strategic enemy, and that Russia already sees itself as engaged in a hybrid war with U.S. for quite some time. Mr Gabuev observed that what Putin thinks matters a lot, and he does not like what he sees. In China, Mr Gabuev suggested President Xi Jinping may not also have much international experience as he has no clear foreign policy track record. His present consolidation of power also means that what Xi thinks greatly affects Chinese foreign policy. Mr Gabuev argued that Presidents Putin and Xi mutually reinforce their own darkest experiences, and they still believe might is right.

In his second area on states that may not be as stable as they appear, Mr Gabuev observed that China has a lot of economic problems. He acknowledged its resolution of many of them over the past few decades and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has turned out to be very adaptive. However, he pointed out that China has not demonstrated this adaptability in the last three years. Whereas civil-society partnership and elections used to be more common, President Xi is now more closed and his present objective is to consolidate more power. Mr Gabuev observed that he does not seem to trust people and want allies. More significantly, Mr Gabuev pointed to capital flight out of China as an indication that there is not as much faith in the Chinese system among the country's elite. Mr Gabuev wondered why the rich Chinese were leaving the country with their money if the country was stable. He noted the same could be observed in Russia.

In Mr Gabuev's final section on radical Islam as a reaction to imperfect capitalism and globalisation, he suggested that the nub of the problem was young individuals being unable to find their place in a global,

capitalist society. Mr Gabuev pointed out that this too was true during the earlier wave of both left and right wing terrorism in the 1970s. He, however, emphasised that the response was social democratic initiatives to alleviate some of these grievances, the result of constructive dialogue and collective consideration. Mr Gabuev, however, was concerned that in this present age of short attention spans, it is now difficult to sustain a similarly good and balanced discussion. He concluded that he unfortunately could not be as optimistic about the state of the world as Amb Bilahari was, and could not help but see things more pessimistically.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Guns and butter: why militaries need to evolve



Mr Ong Ye Kung

*Acting Minister of Education (Higher Education and Skills); and
Senior Minister of State,
Ministry of Defence
Singapore*

Minister Ong Ye Kung opened his keynote address by highlighting the objectives of APPSMO and grading them. In his opinion, APPSMO scores an (i) A+ in providing rising military leaders a chance to break away from work and reflect on the military profession; a (ii) B+ in allowing new generation of officers to build ties with each other through interaction and time spent together; and (iii) remains ungraded in acquiring new perspectives on geopolitical issues and military strategy through open interaction, as the nature of warfare is constantly evolving.

Minister Ong then proceeded to address the theme of APPSMO 2016, Hybrid Warfare and the Role of the Military: Challenges and Implications, by defining hybrid warfare. In his opinion, war is conventional in the sense that it involves militaries and weapons, but adopts unconventional qualities when economic sanctions, propaganda, proxy wars and cyber-attacks are added to the mix. However, unconventional means such as misinformation and use of economics to defeat an adversary are not new. Misinformation has been used in ancient times, since the period of the Three Kingdoms in China, and the draining of the adversary's economy was how the Cold War was won. The difference between current hybrid warfare and how it was conducted in the past is that unconventional means are used alongside military tools due to the former's availability.

Minister Ong explained that unconventional means are readily applicable firstly due to globalisation, leading to interdependency. Accordingly, interdependency has allowed economic sanctions to become more effective via the deprivation of trade as a coercive measure. Secondly, technology has enabled wider information operations due to its power to transmit information as seen in the Islamic State's media outreach.

The Islamic State has managed to achieve media outreach like that of multinational corporations through news networks and social media with information tailored to specific audiences. Mainstream media further promotes the Islamic State's messages due to their need for sensationalism. Fundamentally, the message is to cause distrust between communities, and such ideological exports make counter terrorism more difficult.

In light of unconventional forms of attack, Minister Ong re-emphasised the importance of Singapore's Total Defence policy, a comprehensive framework to tackle broad security challenges. Military defence is constantly evolving and currently incorporating new technologies for the defence of Singapore. Civil defence is key for societal resilience, achieved through everyone playing their part. Social defence is a work-in-progress as a constant balance between national identity and individual group culture needs to be maintained. Economic defence is vital as Singapore is a trade-oriented economy. It is also essential as it allows Singapore to be a place for people to live, work, and feel that it is worth protecting. Psychological defence embodies all other defences and is key to the collective conviction behind the defence of Singapore. It heals internal wounds in times of crisis and gives a sense of "having each other's back".

Minister Ong ended off his keynote address by concluding that the defence of Singapore transcends politics. Faced with hybrid warfare, wider national and social support is required. However, Total Defence continues to be coordinated by the Ministry of Defence despite the involvement of multiple agencies because only the military truly understands the nature of hybrid warfare.

LUNCHEON CONVERSATION

Rethinking warfare and civilisation in the Asia Pacific



Professor Takashi Shiraishi

*President, The National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
Japan*

Professor Takashi Shiraishi began his presentation with the current Japanese security and foreign policies. Since Prime Minister Shinzo Abe came to power in 2012, he established the National Security Council

while the Japanese cabinet had also approved its first National Security Strategy. Additionally, the Japanese government also revised Japan's weapon export principles as well as approved joint international weapons development, production and procurement. Lastly, the government succeeded in getting new security bills, like those involving overseas deployment of the Japanese Self-Defense Force (JSDF), approved in parliament.

Prof Shiraishi explained that the central idea behind all these security and foreign policy initiatives was to enhance Japan's own defence and security. In addition, these policy initiatives would help to strengthen alliance commitments as well as promote networking with the Americans and partners in Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia and around the Indian Ocean region. All of these were especially crucial in an era where the world would witness the greatest shifts of power in the Asia Pacific region in the next decades.

Besides policy initiatives, Prof Shiraishi said that one could also look at where Japan was investing to get a sense of how the country was preparing for the future. In terms of advanced technology, Japan had invested in cyber technology, artificial intelligence, robotics, nanotechnology, and human-machine interfacing. According to Prof Shiraishi, technological development was crucial for countries like Japan where the economy had stagnated for some time, and the population has been declining. Thus, due to domestic constraints, Japan has to invest wisely towards a technological future.

Professor Kishore Mahbubani

Dean and Professor in the Practice of Public Policy, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore Singapore



Professor Kishore Mahbubani opened his presentation by addressing the state of pessimism in the world today. Prof Mahbubani opined that there should be optimism with recent developments instead, and supported his case around three points: (i) the state of the world; (ii) the state of geopolitics; and (iii) the state of ASEAN.

First, Prof Mahbubani believed that the perception of “doom and gloom” was misperceived. He explained that if one looked at it objectively and statistically, the human condition had never been better for three reasons. One, the prospect of war between any major powers was less probable today. Two, the millennium development goal for global poverty was not only met by the target year of 2015, but it had far exceeded the target. Three, it was predicted that there was going to be an explosion of global middle classes. In 2010, there were 1.8 billion people that belonged to the middle class. By 2030, that figure would reach 4.9 billion.

Second, Prof Mahbubani highlighted that the world is going to witness one of the most exciting decades in geopolitical terms. There is going to be a massive transition of power. Since 2014, China’s GDP exceeded the U.S. in terms of Purchasing Power Parity (PPP). In nominal terms, the process would take longer, but it would happen. Whenever the number one power was about to get surpassed by the number two power, things could get difficult. However, both the U.S. and China had a reasonable amicable relationship barring some disagreements. Based on that reason alone, Prof Mahbubani considered this a miracle.

Lastly, Prof Mahbubani was confident that ASEAN would continue to move forward. In the midst of great power rivalry, it should be expected that ASEAN would face challenges. ASEAN was established to develop deep cooperation among member states in the region, and had survived many challenges in the past against all odds. Prof Mahbubani said that there was no reason to believe that ASEAN was not able to do so in the next coming decades.

DISTINGUISHED DINNER LECTURE

Power transition in the Asia Pacific



Professor Jia Qingguo (left) with Professor Joseph Liow

Professor Jia Qingguo

*Dean, Department of Diplomacy, School of International Studies,
Peking University
People's Republic of China*

Professor Jia Qingguo began his talk by outlining three questions that he would try to address during his talk: Firstly, how should one view the on-going transition of power in the Asia Pacific region. Secondly, how this power transition has impacted regional security. Finally, in the face of this power transition, what we should look for in the future. Prof Jia discussed the concepts of soft power and hard power and concluded that these concepts are not new to the Chinese. In fact, ancient advisors to different kingdoms, including Mencius, have discussed these concepts for the last 2,000 years.

Prof Jia observed that if we view the transition of power through the lenses of hard and soft power, then the process of power transition in the Asia Pacific region is by no means complete and he would argue that it is on-going process that is full of uncertainties. In addition, the future of power transition might also not be a linear one. Since 2008, China has been said to be overtaking the United States. However, most Chinese would say that this is only in economic terms – either through PPP or GDP.

Despite rapid sustained economic growth experienced by China, Prof Jia argued that the economic gap between China and the U.S. remains huge. Although the GDP gap between the two countries has been bridged considerably, China lags behind the U.S. on many other issues. Politically, China lags considerably behind the U.S. in the use of soft power. Also, given the many advantages that hegemonic states enjoy, it is much more difficult for a rising power like China to surpass the hegemonic powers. In addition, Prof Jia noted that rising powers such as the Soviet Union or Russia and Japan have tried to overtake the U.S. on different occasions in the past, but have failed to do so.

The differences between China from the Soviet Union or Russia and Japan can be linked to that of strategic depth as well as the strength of its economy. Ultimately, Prof Jia believes that whether China can surpass the U.S. depends on how it conducts itself both at home and abroad and noted that it is too early to come to a definitive conclusion. It would also be useful to study the rise of other powers, particularly India, instead of simply focusing solely on the U.S. and China.

Power transition already has serious impact on regional security even though it is an on-going process. China has undergone drastic and fundamental transformation in the preceding decades. As a result, the Chinese identity has changed in the last few decades. As China makes the transition from the poor and revolutionary power of the past, it faces identity issues as it has not become a status quo power and is not quite as rich or advanced, but somewhere in between. Prof Jia went on to note that identity defines interests, and China's identity and interests as both a developing country and an (emerging) superpower mean that it has caused much confusion while China defines its values, interests and priorities. This has led to incoherent and inconsistent policies, especially in recent years, making it difficult for the rest of the world to understand China at this critical juncture.

With China's rise, many Chinese also believe that China is able to take a more proactive approach to protecting its interests, which it was unable to do in the past because it was weak. It was noted that China's approach

and tough positions did not start during the tenure of current President Xi Jinping, but earlier. With China's rise and increasingly tough stance on issues, some countries have found it important to enhance cooperation with the U.S. in order to protect their security interests.

In addition, with China's rise and increasing assertiveness, the U.S. has to take action to maintain its international credibility as well as fulfil its alliance commitments. In this regard, Prof Jia cites the examples of warships and military aircraft carrying out freedom of navigation exercises in the South China Sea despite its devastating impact on Sino-U.S. relations. With more countries allying with the U.S., more Chinese are starting to believe John Mearsheimer's Thucydides Trap, and that there will be an eventual showdown between China and the United States. With power transition taking some time to complete, Prof Jia predicts that the level of mistrust and tension is likely to continue and will most likely get worse before it gets better.

Prof Jia noted that with the disproportionate level of focus on events in the East China Sea and South China Sea, there was a lack of attention on more important threats to security in the region. Some of these examples included extremism, a lower threshold for the occurrence of military conflicts, and a lack of willingness by great powers to cooperate in defence of the existing security order. This has led to the proliferation of threats such as terrorism, cyber-attacks, nuclear proliferation and maritime disputes.

However, Prof Jia asserted that all is not lost and there are positive signs. The Thucydides Trap may not be the right term to describe the situation as it is too simplistic. History has shown hegemonic and rising powers co-existing peacefully during periods of power transition. The important factor in ensuring peaceful co-existence between hegemonic and rising powers is the manner in which the rising power transitions and rises. Prof Jia noted that China's rise should be a peaceful one as it depends largely on trade and economic expansion and is likely to depend on this in the future. Prof Jia claims that China has tried to fix its borders through negotiation and dialogue and has not engaged in territorial expansion at

this point and is not likely to do so. China's claims in the South and East China Sea is what China has always claimed in the past.

Finally, Prof Jia added that the world has changed with the advent of nuclear weapons and the opposition to the use of force. Economic development has been the centrepiece of countries such as the U.S., Japan and Germany to gain welfare and prestige. Also, China's transition as a rising power is still largely in the right direction as it has interests on the global stage that will determine its foreign policy behaviour. Finally, Prof Jia noted that there are still many people who subscribe to shared interests and noble aspirations of peace, stability and common prosperity instead of conflict of interests and ambitions for domination. In that regard, Prof Jia notes the importance of conferences such as APPSMO as excellent opportunities for engagement.

SESSION I

Dimensions of war and strategy



(L-R) Lieutenant-General H. R. McMaster, Mr Alexander Gabuev, Professor Pascal Vennesson, and Associate Professor Bernard Loo

Lieutenant-General H. R. McMaster, Director, Army Capabilities Integration Centre, United States of America, began his address by defining and explaining what strategy is by using the example of the United States' military's definition of strategy. However, LTG McMaster argued that variables affect strategy, such as political aims, which changes the equation and formulation of strategy. LTG McMaster cited the teachings of classical theorists Sun Tzu and Machivelli, whom he argued teach values related to strategy, such as deception, coalition formation and the disconnect between objectives and the use of violence, and are still very much relevant today. In today's context, LTG McMaster argued that the neglect of the political nature and the context of war has led to difficulties and flaws in defence strategy. Understanding the enduring nature of war, LTG McMaster argued, is fundamental in crafting an effective strategy.

LTG McMaster then highlighted four elements of the enduring nature of war. Firstly, war's political nature. Clear political objectives are fundamental for strategy because that imposes a semblance of rationality on war. Secondly, war's uncertainty. Wars naturally resist rationality and has a tendency towards uncertainty due to the interaction of opposing wills. Strategy, must therefore, adapt to changing conditions. Thirdly, war's human dimension and the ability to convince the enemy that he has been defeated. This also means that a successful strategy would require

convincing not only the local population, but also other allies and even enemies. Lastly, war as a contest of wills. LTG McMaster emphasised the importance of the will to win in any strategy and stated that to go to war without a will to emerge victorious puts one at a severe disadvantage.

Mr Alexander Gabuev, Senior Associate and Chair of the Russia in the Asia Pacific Programme, Carnegie Moscow Centre, The Russian Federation, began his speech by agreeing with the often-expressed view that military force is just one of the tools in the wider national toolkit to achieve a country's goals. He also argued that the decision to go to war is not purely a military decision, but also involves political decision making as well as strategic analysis. He then stressed the importance of civilian analysts in analysing the nature of crisis and who the enemies are, as military intelligence is often limited in terms of scope. The difference between military analysts and diplomats was also highlighted by Mr Gabuev, who noted that diplomats were often more optimistic in their estimates compared to their military counterparts. Additionally, Mr Gabuev argued that what intelligence agencies tend to ignore, is that 97 per cent of information needed to make a decision is already freely available, and that only about three per cent of the information required is of the "top secret" and "secret" nature.

Mr Gabuev then touched on the issue of the Ukraine crisis and questioned whether Russian use of military force was successful and whether it was well informed by domestic civilian intelligence agencies. At the strategic level, Mr Gabuev commented that Ukraine was where Russia obtained its culture and Kiev was the mother of Russian cities. The population in Ukraine was also almost half Russian and it was within Russian interests to keep Ukraine within its sphere of interests because Ukraine is an excellent natural gas customer and because of Russian exports to Ukraine. The strategic environment was also important, as Crimea held one of the most important naval bases in the Black Sea and relocating the base back onto Russian territory was simply too expensive. This was in addition to the perception by Russian security agencies that Western powers were attempting to integrate Ukraine into the European Union that Russia perceived to be a threat.

Mr Gabuev surmised that two years after shots were first fired, that there is a general perception, even amongst the ethnic Russian population in Ukraine that the Russian forces are invaders. This perception has in turn, shaped national identity in Ukraine against the Russians. Bilateral trade,

which once used to be in favour of Russia has also dropped to US\$16 billion. Russia has also faced international sanctions and isolation for its actions, and capital outflow in the wake of Crimea totalled about US\$100 billion. Mr Gabuev argued that even though the military was used effectively, Russia had failed at the strategic level and this was due in part to the top-down approach taken by Russian intelligence agencies. In addition, there was inadequate fusion of information between the various intelligence agencies, which eventually gave inadequate intelligence of how the Ukrainian population would react.

Professor Pascal Vennesson, Professor of Political Science, Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS, Singapore, began his speech by observing the interaction between technology and strategy as well as the tight connection between strategy, war making and technology since ancient times. In recent years, many armed forces in the region have adopted an approach of modernisation which covers the three domains of air, land and sea. As such, the interaction between technology and the use of force is of fundamental importance today, especially in this region. However, Prof Vennesson argued that time and time again, such smart defence technology can make us strategically stupid and have problematic and unintended consequences from an operational and a political standpoint. We would then need to be aware of these consequences. Prof Vennesson cited the examples of General Tommy Franks and General Douglas MacArthur to show how technology can disrupt the military leader's sense-making as well as limiting how military leaders search for actual data and information. Technology, Prof Vennesson argued, can weaken the military leader's mental model that is essential for decision making.

In March 2003, General Franks was using the blue force tracker that showed the locations of U.S. units as well as enemy units. On his screen, it seemed that there were no enemy units close to where the U.S. forces were, but yet, the U.S. forces were not moving. General Franks was furious and called the force commander demanding an explanation. In reality, one of the fiercest battles of the war was unfolding. General Franks was unable to see this as his map was displaying the wrong scale. In contrast, when General MacArthur wanted to find out whether

U.S. forces would be able to support South Korean ground forces during the onset of the Korean war in 1950, MacArthur met the South Korean soldiers on the ground and made a personal observation that the South Korean ground forces were a disciplined force, but would require intervention from the U.S. in the form of additional resources. The onsite perspective allowed General MacArthur to experience first-hand the situation on the ground, which allowed him to make a more informed decision.

Thus, Prof Vennesson argued that an over-reliance on technology can have unintended consequences and can disrupt a military commander's sense-making. The use of technology also means we can use algorithms and pre-defined conditions to determine what is essential and non-essential and can limit our search for data. Strategy, Prof Vennesson noted, is about finding the right cues and finding the critical data elements. Thus, the "fine grain" information that General MacArthur would need came from his site visit and gave him better "sense-making" as a result. There is also a risk that with information technology, the mental models of military leaders might be weakened.

Summing up, Prof Vennesson stressed that a military leader's strategic models and mental models get richer with experience and evolve over time. Thus, even as technology becomes more commonplace, it must not come at the expense of a military leader's sense-making and exposure being substituted and limited by technology. How can technology be used to sustain and not dominate the commander's strategic intuitions and safeguard his expertise? The more successfully these questions are answered, the more effective the military will be as a fighting force.

SESSION II

Hybrid threats and the future of warfare



(L-R) Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim, Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain, Mr Stephan de Spiegeleire, and Mr Richard Bitzinger

Associate Professor Ahmed Salah Hashim, Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS, Singapore, began by highlighting that hybrid warfare or a blend of various types of warfare has long existed and it is not a new term. He added that the term hybrid warfare is a useful term to highlight or draw out certain characteristics of contemporary warfare. During the first Gulf War, many countries were stunned by the low level of U.S. casualties and the high number of Iraqi casualties. Countries around the world, including U.S. allies, began to study the first Gulf War in order to keep up with U.S. military power. It was realised that it is difficult to emulate U.S. conventional military capabilities, as such, the counter would be to get around it by other means. In other words, hybrid warfare is an add-on to existing military capabilities, utilised by both state and non-state actors.

Hybrid warfare has elements of soft power that is not kinetic or military. It allows war to be waged by state and non-state actors and is not a prediction of future wars. The perimeters of war have been limited by the west through international law, thereby leading to the narrow perception of conventional war. Furthermore, the narrow perception of war neglects the transcultural and ethnocentric nature of warfare which is highlighted by hybrid warfare. Hybrid warfare is thus cultural and is not replacing interstate conventional warfare.

Hybrid warfare can be described as a cocktail of conventional military capabilities, insurgencies, terrorism, guerrilla warfare, organised crime, cyber war, etc. The aim is to bring a state to paralysis. The characteristic of hybrid warfare by non-state actors sees the progression from terrorism to guerrilla warfare to regular warfare, and the ability to move up and down the progression according to the environment and circumstance. Slightly unlike non-state actors, state use of hybrid warfare is used in lieu of escalation to outright war, keeping it below the threshold of conventional warfare.

Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain, Senior Fellow, Delhi Policy Group; and Visiting Fellow, Vivekananda International Foundation, Republic of India, began by describing hybrid warfare as a mix-and-match from a spectrum to domains to attack, and the key is to find the right mix of domains. He then explained that over the last 26 years, hybrid conflict was and is underway in Kashmir. Since 1971, Pakistan accepted that it was and is unable to match India in terms of conventional military force. As such, Pakistan acquired nuclear capability to overcome the asymmetry. Pakistan also befriended rich Islamic states and waited for the opportunity to exploit weakness in Indian society.

In response, India has selected domains to attack to keep the overall situation in Kashmir below a threshold. Between 1989 and 2010, a conventional counter insurgency conflict was fought in Kashmir. The elimination of insurgents was enough to keep the numbers of insurgents down, but ran the risk of over-extending the military in the long run. Between 2010 and 2012, a new approach was adopted. It was identified that the centre of gravity of the conflict in Kashmir is the idea of Kashmiri independence. Therefore, victory is not defined by the capture of territory or subjugation, but a permanent arrangement and integration of the people of Kashmir.

In order to achieve victory, the key is to restore the dignity of people through education, counselling, skills training, etc. The concept of winning the “hearts and minds” of the people is just a tactical measure if adopted superficially. There needs to be concrete action to match psychological policy. Therefore, LTG Hasnain suggested that to tackle the psychological and social aspect of the conflict, a study of the cultural terrain is required to understand the local aspiration. It is only through tangible and realisable meeting of local aspirations, that there can be a sustainable peaceful end to the conflict. The implication of this approach

is the fundamental change in the approach to the conduct of security measures and interaction with the civilian population.

Mr Stephan de Spiegeleire, Principal Scientist, The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies, The Netherlands, began by highlighting the framing problem of the concepts of security and defence, which focuses on securing territory, and is inadequate to address hybrid warfare. This is due to the mindset that past approaches have been successful in addressing security issues and therefore would be suitable today. Hence, hybrid warfare is a “wake up call” to rethink the approach to security and defence, and what they are about.

Mr Speigeleire first explained the history of various terms used in security and defence. “Security” in Latin can be translated as ‘free from care’. If the ultimate objective is to protect people, then everything done must be seen as functioning towards the ultimate objective of easing worries about threats. “Defence” is the active activity to remove threats that might threaten security. “Military” is the assembly of men who serve the roles and responsibilities of providing security.

Mr Speigeleire next went on to discuss periods of societal development when studying war. Current studies of war focuses on industrial societies. The Industrial Revolution not only brought about physical technological change such as industrial scale machinery, it also brought about social technology. Mr Speigeleire explained that social technology is organisation and specialisation, such as enterprises and assembly lines, which arose from physical technological change. He suggested that security and defence should be thought of as an ecosystem whereby any action would have effects on other aspects and domains.

Borrowing from design engineering, Mr Speigeleire proposed that security should be designed by approaching security as an ecosystem. Only by holistically considering the roles of all the ecosystem components will sustainable security solutions be possible. Additionally, the roles of national militaries within their security ecosystems and the limitations of the various state armed forces must be identified and acknowledged respectively. Lastly Mr Speigeleire noted that smaller countries have an advantage over large countries due to their ease of manoeuvrability in the transition to the post-industrial age.

SESSION III

Information and cyber warfare: the military dimension



(L-R) Mr David Koh, Professor Itzik Ben-Israel, Dr Zhu Qi Chao, and Mr Benjamin Ang

Dr Zhu Qi Chao, Director and Professor, Centre for National Security and Strategic Studies, National University of Defence Technology, People's Republic of China, raised the question of cyber deterrence and nuclear deterrence and if they can be equated? Cyber deterrence, as he explained from the perspectives of the United States, Russia and China, is similar to the situation of nuclear deterrence in that all three countries have extensive cyber and nuclear capabilities. Cyber technology is widely accessible in this day and age. With the increased use of data and technology collation, there is a risk and implication to critical systems. Cyber warfare is very much the strategic war of the information age. Do these implications then mirror those of nuclear warfare? The implications of cyber warfare seem to be more extensive with a wider range of stakeholders involved. Yet, the level of importance of cyber deterrence comes second to nuclear deterrence.

Cyber deterrence and nuclear deterrence share many similarities. For instance, Dr Zhu mentioned that both favour the offence rather than defence, with both capable of causing catastrophic damage and societal shock. It is therefore important to understand the difference between nuclear and cyber deterrence. In cyber warfare, the line between peace and war is less demarcated. The extent of threat is more difficult to

calculate than a physical war. The verification of aims and attribution of responsibilities of attacks become more difficult to identify.

The increased application of Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) results in an expansion of the internet based economy. These electronic advancements highlight the importance of cyber security against the extensive potential threat the former may bring. Attacks on structures, intrusions of networks and compromises on data and personal information are but a few areas of threat cyber warfare can bring. More importantly, cyber warfare fundamentally boosts the speed of attack. No longer will attacks be long-drawn and physical, instead they will aim to rapidly suppress the state and corrupt military control systems.

Dr Zhu proposed a credible cyber deterrence strategy, based on a cyber security framework. This would deal with threats ranging from strategic cyber warfare targeting critical infrastructure and key military targets, to operational cyber warfare such as cyber terrorism, to cyber espionage and crime. To establish this kind of framework for cyber deterrence, it needs to adapt certain key elements from the older nuclear concept. "Red lines" and thresholds need to be established – what will states tolerate, and where are the red lines? How they express these thresholds needs to be established as well. Dr Zhu also stressed the need for international cooperation, and the establishing of international norms of conduct, similar to how these have evolved regarding nuclear weapons.

Professor Itzik Ben-Israel, Head of Workshop for Science, Technology and Security, Tel-Aviv University, Israel, focused his speech on the military dimension of cyber warfare. Tracing the various waves of change such as the agricultural, industrial and the information age, he highlighted that the information age was indeed going through an evolution, a cyber security evolution. The rapid evolution of computer technology has profoundly impacted all human activities, including warfare. From mainframes in the 1970s to advanced computers installed in the munitions themselves, computers are increasingly miniaturised, cheaper, and omnipresent. But it begs the question: if everything is computerised, why not target the computer itself?

Prof Ben-Israel highlighted three broken paradigms of cyber warfare: it is not only about information; not only about the internet; and not only about computers. In the 2010 Stuxnet attack against the Nantaz plant,

the worm found its way into a non-networked computer system, attacked the air-conditioning controllers that caused overheating, and leading to physically damaged centrifuges. The attack removed a distinction between the informational and the physical. Previously, a state would seek to neutralise the military forces of its enemy. Today, cyber-attacks can be used as a weapon directly against the enemy's industry and critical infrastructure without mobilising huge militaries needed to first neutralise the adversary's forces.

Likening cyber warfare to the concept of ying and yang, the good and bad of technology, is a dilemma between dependency versus efficiency. While increasingly networked societies can be more efficient, the dependency that is born from the reliance on the technology causes threats in and of itself. Critical infrastructure, like the water supply in the Battle of Singapore (WWII) or the Ukrainian electrical grid in the present Ukraine-Russia conflict, can and has been targeted. The threat of system infiltration in the age of cyber warfare is hence very possible and needs to be handled with care.

Mr David Koh, Deputy Secretary (Technology), Ministry of Defence; and Chief Executive, Cyber Security Agency, Singapore, spoke about cyber security and the military. Cyber technology brings about connectivity, increasing the sharing of information and access to information, broadening the worldview of many people. At the same time, such interconnectivity makes it more pervasive and allows for hacking to be done more easily into military and civilian communication systems. Cyber technology also allows for the advancement of weapons, helping to increase the ability of security forces.

An important concept to understand about cyber technology is, as Mr Koh emphasises, its transnational nature. Necessarily, this nature is also brought into the various threats that may stem from it. Transnational threats become very real and the far-reaching impact of such technology should not be ignored. In fact, such threat possibilities call for supranational critical information infrastructure (CII).

What challenges do these bring to the military? Mr Koh identified the civil-military divide as a stumbling block. It requires increased and improved cooperation such as the pooling of resources and information for central use when necessary. This is a test of needs between multiple agencies.

There is also a necessity to establish cross-border cooperation. Yet this also means that there are more potential points for conflict and miscommunication.

However, any improvement in relations with international partners helps progressively build a consensus of action in the cyber domain. This includes knowledge sharing and building of trust. This decreases the chances of miscalculation and miscommunication. With regards to such a consensus, the legality of it becomes crucial. To agree on what is legal and what is not is crucial, given the varying laws of different countries. Increased discussion and dialogue on policy and legal collaboration helps establish common goals and understanding, creating a fair system and rules of the road. Supporting ADMM-Plus Cyber Committee is a good first step, as was the Cyber Panel at the 2016 Shangri-La Dialogue.

Ultimately, cyber security is governed by the behaviour of users rather than a fixed authority. It is therefore important to measure most accurately the pros, cons and threats arising from cyber technology and to achieve a healthy balance of these factors. Cyber is here to stay – it is up to us to learn how to live with it.

SESSION IV

Civilian-military relations and a whole-of-government approach towards security



(L-R) Associate Professor Kumar Ramakrishna, Mrs Isabelle Barras, Mr Steve Kosiak, and Professor Tan See Seng

Mr Steve Kosiak, Former Associate Director for Defense and International Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), White House; and Partner, ISM Strategies, United States of America, began his presentation by highlighting that as U.S. national security efforts began to focus increasingly on countering instability and violent extremism in the Middle East and elsewhere, threats and challenges became multi-dimensional as well. Within each area of security, there were also different dimensions to its responses, which could fall under economic assistance, military assistance, humanitarian assistance and even assistance that had homeland security aspects to it. As such, the U.S. government had sought to strengthen its national security in this complex environment through a whole-of-government approach.

Next, Mr Kosiak explained the process of integrating the various tools of national security policy under the whole-of-government approach, focusing on the policy development, planning and budgeting processes. According to Mr Kosiak, there were two entities that held the key to organising the U.S.' whole-of-government approach. One was the National Security Council (NSC), and the other would be the Office of Management and Budget (OMB).

The NSC's role was to decide on the national security issues to focus on, and run a process of bringing together all the different agencies to address those challenges. From the mid-level personnel up to the Secretary-level, the NSC was able to make recommendations and bring those up to the highest level of decision making. On the other hand, the OMB would allocate resources amongst the different agencies through a formal budget process. The OMB would also ensure that all the priorities were reflected in the agencies' budget.

Lastly, Mr Kosiak touched on the strengths and weaknesses of the whole-of-government process as well as suggested some possible ways of improving it. With respect to the strengths, both the NSC and OMB had very professional staff and some of the "best minds" working for them. The NSC, in particular, was able to focus the attention of all the other agencies, and ensure that their resources were dedicated to addressing those challenges. In addition, the two entities had developed a very good working relationship.

Nevertheless, the fundamental weakness behind it was the "stove-pipe" problem. For the most part, there had not been a lot of inter-agency coordination. All the agencies developed their own budget and programs independent of each other. Another weakness was that there had been insufficient effort to look at future types of challenges. A lot of focus had been on current challenges in particular crises and situations. There was also no real effort to look across agencies and conduct a process of comparison and cost-effective analysis on resource allocation, to see if shifts were needed. The other weakness lie in the small staff size of NSC and OMB, which posed a difficulty in performing cross-agency analysis.

In conclusion, Mr Kosiak suggested that the number of staff could be increased so as to more effectively work on cross-agency analysis. Political will was also needed when there had to be a decision on shifting resources.

Associate Professor Kumar Ramakrishna, Head of Policy Studies; and Coordinator, National Security Studies Programme (NSSP), RSIS, Singapore opened his presentation by providing an overview of the transnational terrorist threat in Southeast Asia, with the emergence of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) threat in the region. Assoc Prof

Ramakrishna explained that the ISIS threat was not something that the region had not seen before. In the early 2000s, the region had witnessed a similar threat from the Jemaah Islamiah (JI) network. Like ISIS, the JI had also wanted to create a Pan-Southeast Asian Islamic State.

Assoc Prof Ramakrishna mentioned that there were some reports in April 2016 that highlighted some movement towards the announcement of the province of a caliphate in Southeast Asia, starting in Southern Philippines. Regional groups in Indonesia and Southern Philippines had also pledged allegiance to ISIS. Separately, there had also been a proliferation of the Malay language and Bahasa Indonesian websites and publications that helped spread ISIS propaganda. All of these suggested that ISIS had truly penetrated into the region.

Thus, Assoc Prof Ramakrishna opined that future attacks in the region would take the form of local plots in the region inspired by ISIS. Already, Singapore had twice arrested several radicalised foreign workers from Bangladesh. Malaysia had also carried out arrests of more than 100 people related to ISIS in 2015. Additionally, Indonesia conducted a series of terrorism-related arrests. By the end of 2016, several militants in Indonesian prisons would be released. It was still unclear whether these individuals would be considered as rehabilitated or they might return to join their old comrades. Given so, the ISIS threat is constantly evolving.

Assoc Prof Ramakrishna explained that there were three drivers of the ISIS threat in Southeast Asia. Firstly, ISIS is driven by an ideology based on a war between the Islamic community and the West and its friends. Under this ideology, there is no such thing as innocent civilians. While civilians might not have been involved in conflict zones overseas, their political support and taxes had enabled their governments to do so. Thus, civilians could be considered as legitimate targets. Secondly, all believers should stick together relative to non-believers, under a very strong ideological mindset of us against them. Thirdly, social media and technology is a force multiplier for ISIS. One could be easily self-radicalised through a smart-phone.

Summing up, Assoc Prof Ramakrishna said that there were two strategic options to addressing the ISIS threat. One would be the hard option, where there is a strong focus on the use of military force. Civilian casualties should not interfere with the accomplishment of a mission. The other would be the smart option, which Assoc Prof Ramakrishna advocated. This would involve a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach. Essentially, military force should be calibrated to avoid collateral damage, which could be exploited as negative propaganda. Religious and community groups were also important as better ideas should be used to defeat an ideology, rather than just “guns and bombs”.

Mrs Isabelle Barras, Regional Head, International Committee of the Red Cross, started her presentation by introducing the different components to the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and what were their different mandates and roles. First, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), an independent, neutral and impartial humanitarian organisation, had the international legal mandate for providing and offering assistance during armed conflict and other situations of violence. It had special responsibilities under international humanitarian law. Second, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) was a body composed of all the National Societies of Red Cross and Red Crescent. It was established to encourage, facilitate and promote all humanitarian activities carried out by its member National Societies.

Mrs Barras next highlighted the Movement’s recognition of the positive contributions of the military when responding to crisis situations. In particular, the military had essential roles to play in large-scale disasters, such as providing security as well as opening and strengthening of critical infrastructure including air and sea ports, and other crucial services. In recent years, there had been increasing demands for the armed forces to play a larger role in relief activities domestically and internationally. For instance, during Typhoon Haiyan, more than 20 different nations sent their armed forces at the request of the Government of the Philippines to provide supporting logistics, transport, medical assistance, search and rescue, and other relief activities. Due to the scale and complexities of disasters, especially in overpopulated urban settings, militaries could provide critical and specific support.

As military roles expand beyond defence and emergency response, Mrs Barras said that the close cooperation between National Societies and the military during major relief distribution could be controversial. One of the most important challenges, that civil-military cooperation posed, came from the importance of perception. Increased civil-military coordination could challenge the space for principled humanitarian action by framing humanitarian action as a tool to achieve political objectives. While the interaction with the military could be important, it cannot reach the level of being misinterpreted as subordination or sub-contracting to the military. In some sensitive environments, it is important to ensure physical separation between the actors. This is to preserve the independence and neutrality of the Red Cross.

On mitigating measures, Mrs Barras shared that there were guidelines that spoke about recourse to military assets in crisis situations as the last resort. The use of military assets was important, but it should not be automatic. Separately, the question of how beneficiaries might perceive humanitarian services needed to be asked. Being sensitive to the way humanitarian aid is perceived, would allow the Red Cross to identify when and where the preservation of the independence and neutrality of humanitarian action was required. Each situation would be different and the interests and needs of affected people should be the primary objective when choosing the most efficient type of response.

CLOSING ROUNDTABLE

New threats and challenges in the Asia Pacific



(L-R) Dr C. Raja Mohan, Vice Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda, Dr Zhu Qi Chao, and Associate Professor Ralf Emmers

Vice-Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda, Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force, Japan, spoke about the world security phenomena from a military lens, with regards in particular to hybrid warfare. He highlighted hybrid warfare as a double-edged sword with both destructive capability and the capability to influence. Given its pervasive and nondescript nature, it complicates issues for consideration such as the identification of parties involved in hybrid warfare. This is especially so as hybrid warfare can be taken up by both state and non-state actors. It tests the evolution and revolution of knowledge use in the modern day, reaching beyond the traditional boundaries of warfare.

Consequently, VADM Koda emphasised that the primary role of defence should necessarily be in the physical form and hybrid warfare merely a secondary role. He pointed out the possibility of cooperation between the two, viewing them as interlinked rather than two separate entities. This undeniably raises the dilemma of resource allocation between the two. A misallocation of resources, particularly when there is limited physical force capability, could result in adverse reduction of warfighting prowess. Such a disadvantage is easily manipulated in the arena of warfare. The aversion to hybrid warfare, he mentions, emphasising the technological aspects, should not come across as overwhelming and uncontrollable. Instead, technological advances in this aspect should be embraced with the right balance, understanding and control.

Therefore, in the realm of hybrid warfare, it is crucial to wisely identify the parties and opponents involved as well as the correct measures and responses to adopt. It is, at the end of the day, a connected use and balance of methods that achieves the best intentions and outcomes.

Dr C. Raja Mohan, Head, Strategic Studies; and Distinguished Fellow, Observer Research Foundation, Republic of India, focused on the challenges of the changing climate and understanding of war. It goes beyond the varying strategic and political assumptions, to structural and qualitative changes in warfare. Zooming out to the bigger story, the changing climate as a result of a shift in power distribution across the world has shaken the relative and delicate balance of relations. He noted that wars often occur in a time of instability and change in power distribution. Grasping this becomes very critical and needs to be dealt with carefully to ensure avoidance of escalation of conflict in the midst of relative instability. He followed this by pointing out the factors resulting in these changes in power distribution, namely changing economic distribution and internal political change.

Production economies and wealth have increasingly over the decades shifted from the West to the East. From this shift, a new lens of perspective shapes the focus and military outlook on issues of today. Using Brexit and the U.S. elections as examples, Dr Mohan illustrated how political problems were no longer abstract and theoretical, but rather included an immediate push factor – human agency of the wider community. The idea that problems and the wider community are more connected in this day and age presents a challenge in itself. One therefore must ask, what becomes of people if fundamental beliefs and structures are taken away?

Dr Mohan highlighted the possibility of increased marginalisation of the peoples. Through the outsourcing of jobs that increase social resentments, use of artificial intelligence in replacement of labour and the use of revolutionised technology, the rate of employment of local human resources will likely decrease. This adds to the extent of impact from the wider community on internal political changes.

Beyond economics and politics, the concept of space and borders are identified by terminology such as Asia, Asia Pacific or South Asia for instance. Such terminology however, are subject to change, especially as China and India start to grow. This change would alter the understanding of physical space and changes how regions will be understood and organised. With hybrid warfare and changing understandings, there is no longer a defined indicator of where the divisions and boundaries lie. Instead, more abstract perceptions of space will be increasingly adopted and this would necessarily imply a change in geographical and security concepts.

Dr Mohan concluded by pointing out the increased use of asymmetric capabilities as a means to challenge conventional military tactics. Rather than deal with issues in the same confrontational way, more alternative tactics are used to avoid head-to-head warfare. This would, as time passes, become key to tackling conflicts in hybrid warfare.

Dr Zhu Qi Chao, Director and Professor, Centre for National Security and Strategic Studies, National University of Defence Technology, People's Republic of China, spoke on understanding China and coping with future war threats. He mentioned China's strengthening military presence in the region, which is commonly viewed as an increasing threat. However, he highlighted this perspective as a misconception. Coloured by Cold War thinking, many may have missed out on China's attempt to seek understanding and balance in the changing world order. Contrary to being a threat, China's rise will be, as Dr Zhu perceives, the stabilising factor in the region. He justified this statement with three points.

Firstly, he touched on China's capability and intentions. With increasing military and economic power, China concurrently faces growing security threats from all aspects. This includes economic security, military security and political security. China thus adopts an active defence principle. Dr Zhu further elaborated on this, putting forth the idea that China would never wilfully push herself into a war. Even more so, China would never want to become a hegemonic power.

Secondly, Dr Zhu gave insight into China's inclination towards abiding by and keeping international principles and law. He explained the benefits of this inclination such as increased integration of China with the world and the lessened chance of violating international regulations.

Thirdly, China would never close her doors to bilateral connections and relations and has for many years upheld such bilateral cooperation. This not only enables China to face disputes but also extend herself to multilateral understanding and cooperation.

“Haste makes waste” was the phrase used by Dr Zhu to sum up the importance of objectively understanding China and comprehending that China has no intention to implement any isolationist policies.

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

Day 1

5 August 2016, Friday

0930 hrs Welcome Remarks
Ambassador Ong Keng Yong
*Executive Deputy Chairman, RSIS; and Director, IDSS
Singapore*

0935 hrs Scene-setting Lecture
Ambassador Bilahari Kausikan
*Ambassador-at-Large and Policy Adviser,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Singapore*

1000 hrs Scene-setting Roundtable
Geopolitics and Trends in the Asia Pacific

Speakers:

Mr Alexander Gabuev
*Senior Associate and Chair, Russia in the Asia Pacific
Program, Carnegie Moscow Center
The Russian Federation*

Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain
*Senior Fellow, Delhi Policy Group; and Visiting Fellow,
Vivekananda International Foundation
Republic of India*

Vice-Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda
*Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force
Japan*

Chairperson:

Professor Joseph Liow
*Dean, RSIS
Singapore*

1300 hrs Keynote Address

Mr Ong Ye Kung
*Acting Minister for Education (Higher Education and Skills);
and Senior Minister of State for Defence, Ministry of
Defence
Singapore*

1400 hrs Group Photo-taking

**1530 hrs Visit to Changi Regional HADR
Coordination Centre (RHCC)**

1900 hrs Opening Dinner

Guest of Honour:
Lieutenant-General Perry Lim
*Chief of Defence Force, Singapore Armed Forces
Singapore*

**Day 2
6 August 2016, Saturday**

0830 hrs Introduction by Participants
United States of America, United Kingdom, Timor Leste,
The Philippines, Thailand, Switzerland

0945 hrs Session I
Dimensions of war and strategy

Speakers:
Lieutenant-General H. R. McMaster
*Director, Army Capabilities Integration Centre
United States of America*

Mr Alexander Gabuev
*Senior Associate and Chair of the Russia in the Asia Pacific
Program, Carnegie Moscow Centre
The Russian Federation*

Professor Pascal Vennesson
*Professor of Political Science,
Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore*

Chairperson:

Associate Professor Bernard Loo
*Coordinator of MSc (Strategic Studies) Programme,
Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore*

1300 hrs Briefing on Singapore's WWII History

1400 hrs Changi Heritage Tour and Visit to the Battlebox

Day 3

7 August 2016, Sunday

0830 hrs Introduction by Participants

Sri Lanka, Singapore, Korea, Qatar, New Zealand

0945 hrs Session II

Hybrid threats and the future of warfare

Speakers:

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

Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain
*Senior Fellow, Delhi Policy Group; and Visiting Fellow,
Vivekananda International Foundation
Republic of India*

Mr Stephan de Spiegeleire
*Principal Scientist, The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies
The Netherlands*

Chairperson:

Mr Richard Bitzinger
*Senior Fellow and Coordinator of the Military
Transformations Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore*

**1130 hrs Syndicated Discussion/Working Lunch
(Panel Sessions I & II)**

Syndicate Guest Speakers:

Lieutenant-General H. R. McMaster
*Director, Army Capabilities Integration Centre
United States of America*

Mr Alexander Gabuev
*Senior Associate and Chair of the Russia in the
Asia Pacific Program, Carnegie Moscow Centre
The Russian Federation*

Professor Pascal Vennesson
*Professor of Political Science, Military Studies Programme,
IDSS, RSIS
Singapore*

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

Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain
*Vivekananda International Foundation
Republic of India*

Mr Stephan de Spiegeleire
*Principal Scientist, The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies
The Netherlands*

1430 hrs Visit to PSA

Day 4

8 August 2016, Monday

0830 hrs **Introduction by Participants**
Myanmar, Malaysia, Laos, Japan, Italy

0945 hrs **Session III**
Information and cyber warfare: the military dimension

Speakers:

Dr Zhu Qi Chao

*Director and Professor, Centre for National Security
and Strategic Studies, National University
of Defence Technology
People's Republic of China*

Professor Itzik Ben-Israel

*Head of Workshop for Science, Technology and Security,
Tel-Aviv University
Israel*

Mr David Koh

*Deputy Secretary (Technology), Ministry of Defence;
and Chief Executive, Cyber Security Agency
Singapore*

Chairperson:

Mr Benjamin Ang

*Senior Fellow, Centre of Excellence
for National Security, RSIS
Singapore*

1130 hrs **Luncheon Conversation**
Rethinking warfare and civilisation in the Asia Pacific

Speakers:

Professor Takashi Shiraishi

*President, The National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
Japan*

Professor Kishore Mahbubani
*Dean and Professor in the Practice of Public Policy,
Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy,
National University of Singapore
Singapore*

Chairperson:

Associate Professor Ralf Emmers
*Associate Dean, RSIS; and Head of the Centre for
Multilateralism Studies
Singapore*

1400 hrs Visit to Singapore Changi Airport

1900 hrs Distinguished Dinner Lecture
Power transition in the Asia Pacific

Speaker:

Professor Jia Qingguo
*Dean, Department of Diplomacy, School of International
Studies, Peking University
People's Republic of China*

Chairperson:

Professor Joseph Liow
*Dean, RSIS
Singapore*

Day 5

9 August 2016, Tuesday

0830 hrs **Introduction by Participants**
Indonesia, India, Germany, France, China

0945 hrs **Session IV**
Civilian-military relations and a whole-of-government approach towards security

Speakers:

Mr Steve Kosiak

Former Associate Director for Defense and International Affairs, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), White House; and Partner, ISM Strategies United States of America

Associate Professor Kumar Ramakrishna
Head of Policy Studies; and Coordinator of the National Security Studies Programme (NSSP), RSIS Singapore

Mrs Isabelle Barras
Head of Regional Delegation, International Committee of the Red Cross

Chairperson:

Professor Tan See Seng
Deputy Director and Head of Research, IDSS, RSIS Singapore

1130 hrs **Syndicated Discussion/Working Lunch**
(Panel Sessions III & IV)

Syndicate Guest Speakers:

Dr Zhu Qi Chao

Director and Professor, Centre for National Security and Strategic Studies, National University of Defence Technology People's Republic of China

Professor Itzik Ben-Israel
*Head of Workshop for Science, Technology and Security,
Tel-Aviv University
Israel*

Mr Steve Kosiak
*Former Associate Director for Defense and International
Affairs, Office of and Budget (OMB), White House; and
Partner, ISM Strategies
United States of America*

Associate Professor Kumar Ramakrishna
*Head of Policy Studies; and Coordinator of the National
Security Studies Programme (NSSP), RSIS
Singapore*

Mrs Isabelle Barras
*Head of Regional Delegation, International Committee
of the Red Cross*

1730 hrs National Day Celebrations

Day 6 10 August 2016, Wednesday

0830 hrs Introduction by Participants
Canada, Cambodia, Brunei, Bangladesh, Australia

0945 hrs Closing Roundtable
New threats and challenges in the Asia Pacific

Speakers:
Vice-Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda
*Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force
Japan*

Dr C. Raja Mohan
*Head, Strategic Studies; and Distinguished Fellow,
Observer Research Foundation
Republic of India*

Dr Zhu Qi Chao
*Director and Professor, Centre for National Security
and Strategic Studies, National University of
Defence Technology
People's Republic of China*

Chairperson:

Associate Professor Ralf Emmers
*Associate Dean, RSIS; and Head of the Centre for
Multilateralism Studies
Singapore*

1200 hrs Presentation of Certificates

Closing Remarks and Farewell Lunch

LIST OF SPEAKERS

Mrs Isabelle Barras

Head of Regional Delegation,
International Committee of the Red Cross

Professor Itzik Ben-Israel

Head of Workshop for Science,
Technology and Security, Tel-Aviv University
Israel

Alexander Gabuev

Senior Associate and Chair of the Russia in the Asia Pacific Program,
Carnegie Moscow Centre
The Russian Federation

Associate Professor Ahmed Hashim

Military Studies Programme, ID SS, RSIS
Singapore

Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Syed Ata Hasnain

Senior Fellow, Delhi Policy Group, and Visiting Fellow, Vivekananda
International Foundation
Republic of India

Professor Jia Qingguo

Dean, Department of Diplomacy, School of International Studies,
Peking University
People's Republic of China

Ambassador Bilahari Kausikan

Ambassador-at-Large and Policy Adviser, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Singapore

Vice-Admiral (Ret.) Yoji Koda

Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force
Japan

Mr David Koh

Deputy Secretary (Technology), Ministry of Defence; and
Chief Executive, Cyber Security Agency
Singapore

Mr Steve Kosiak

Former Associate Director for Defense and International Affairs,
Office of Management and Budget (OMB), White House;
and Partner, ISM Strategies
United States of America

Professor Kishore Mahbubani

Dean and Professor in the Practice of Public Policy, Lee Kuan Yew
School of Public Policy, National University of Singapore
Singapore

Lieutenant-General H. R. McMaster

Director, Army Capabilities Integration Centre
United States of America

Dr C. Raja Mohan

Head, Strategic Studies; and Distinguished Fellow,
Observer Research Foundation
Republic of India

Ambassador Ong Keng Yong

Executive Deputy Chairman, RSIS; and Director, IDSS
Singapore

Mr Ong Ye Kung

Acting Minister for Education (Higher Education and Skills); and
Senior Minister of State for Defence, Ministry of Defence
Singapore

Associate Professor Kumar Ramakrishna

Head of Policy Studies; and Coordinator of the
National Security Studies Programme (NSSP), RSIS
Singapore

Professor Takashi Shiraishi

President, The National Graduate Institute for Policy Studies
Japan

Mr Stephan De Spiegeleire

Principal Scientist, The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies
The Netherlands

Professor Pascal Vennesson

Professor of Political Science, Military Studies Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Dr Zhu Qi Chao

Director and Professor, Centre for National Security and Strategic
Studies, National University of Defence Technology
People's Republic of China

LIST OF CHAIRPERSONS

Mr Benjamin Ang

Senior Fellow, Centre of Excellence for National Security, RSIS
Singapore

Mr Richard A. Bitzinger

Senior Fellow and Coordinator of the Military Transformations Programme,
IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Associate Professor Ralf Emmers

Associate Dean, RSIS; and Head of the Centre for Multilateralism Studies
Singapore

Professor Joseph Liow

Dean, RSIS
Singapore

Associate Professor Bernard Loo

Coordinator of MSc (Strategic Studies) Programme, Military Studies
Programme, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

Professor Tan See Seng

Deputy Director and Head of Research, IDSS, RSIS
Singapore

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

AUSTRALIA

GROUP CAPTAIN MATT HEGARTY

Director Strategic Design – Air Force

CAPTAIN HEATH ROBERTSON

Navy International Engagement

BANGLADESH

COLONEL A. K. M. SAIFUL ISLAM

Colonel Administration, National Defence College, Dhaka

BRUNEI

COLONEL (DR) JEFRI HAJI ABD RAZAK

Chief Dental Officer

MRS RUHAIDAH RUSLI

Senior Research Officer,
Directorate of Defence Policy, Ministry of Defence

CAMBODIA

LIEUTENANT COLONEL VANNAK HUN

Deputy of ASEAN Affairs Office

LIEUTENANT COLONEL YA VORK

Deputy Chief of Defence Attaché Management Office

CANADA

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JASON KING

Canadian Liaison Officer to USPACOM

CHINA

COLONEL WANG JUN

Section Chief, West Asian & North African Affairs,
West Asian & African Division, Office for Int Military Cooperation (OIMC),
MND

COLONEL ZHANG XUE JING

Staff Officer

SENIOR COLONEL LIU FANG

Section Chief, Central & Eastern European Affairs,
Europe & Central Asia Division, OIMC, MND

FRANCE

COMMANDER JEAN-RENE DEGANS

Commander (Navy), Planning and Current Operations Centre

CAPTAIN PHILIPPE BAUZON

Captain (Navy), Plans and Policy Division at Joint Staff

GERMANY

CAPTAIN KLAUS HEERMEIER

Chief of Training Division, German Navy Headquarters

CAPTAIN LARS SCHUMANN

Navy HQ, Branch Head Future Development

INDIA

COLONEL SHUBHANKAR BASU

Military Secretary Branch

COLONEL RAVINDER SINGH DADHWAL

Directing Staff, Defence Services Staff College, Wellington

INDONESIA

LIEUTENANT COLONEL HERDY ARIEF BUDIYANTO

Head of Non-ASEAN Cooperation for TNI International Cooperation Centre

LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHANDRA PUTRA RACHMAN

Senior Analyst

ITALY

COLONEL LUCA SPUNTONI

Chief of Airforce Financial Branch, Air General Staff Italy

JAPAN

COLONEL DAIZOU KITA

Joint Military Strategy Office J-5, Joint Staff Office

CAPTAIN HITOSHO SHIMIZU

Staff, Plans and Policy Section, Maritime Staff Office

LAOS

COLONEL BOUAVANH ATHANAXAY

Director of National Defence Department

COLONEL BOUNMYVIENG VIENGNHOUTTHASAT

Foreign Relations Department, MOD

MALAYSIA

COLONEL ABDUL HALIM BIN OTHMAN

Head of Training Development, RMAF

MYANMAR

COLONEL KYAW KYAW MIN

Senior Instructor, National Defence College

COLONEL TUN WIN

Assistant Chief, Office of the Chief of Armed Forces Training

NEW ZEALAND

WING COMMANDER GREGORY BURROUGHS

Director of Career Management (AIR)

LIEUTENANT COLONEL GERALD GORDON LESLIE WINEERA

Deputy Director, Strategic Engagement

QATAR

STAFF COLONEL MESHAAL AL-NASR

OC 12 Squadron (C130J Super Hercules)

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JIN CHULHO

Deputy Director, International Policy Division,
Ministry of National Defence

SINGAPORE

COLONEL CHEW CHUN LIANG

Commander, Naval Military Expert Institution, Ministry of Defence

SENIOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL ANTHONY LEE

Deputy Head Naval Operations (Operations Development and C4 Group), Ministry of Defence

SENIOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL PANG LEAD SHUAN

Commanding Officer, Ministry of Defence

SENIOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL PANG TZER YEU

Branch Head, Ministry of Defence

SENIOR LIEUTENANT COLONEL ANDREW WAN

Deputy Director, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL CHEW ANN BOON

Commanding Officer, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL IAIN HOO

Branch Head, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL KONG EU YEN

Commanding Officer, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL ONG CHER HOWE

Commanding Officer, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL ALAN TOH

Branch Head, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL WANG JIN RONG

Branch Head, Ministry of Defence

LIEUTENANT COLONEL MARCEL XU

Deputy Director, Ministry of Defence

MILITARY EXPERT 6 BERNARD CAI

Branch Head, Ministry of Defence

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR MAHESH UTTAMCHANDANI

Assistant Director, Ministry of Defence

SRI LANKA

**MAJOR GENERAL PUWAKPITIYE UPUL
SATHTHIYAPALA VITHANAGE**

Commander Security Force

SWITZERLAND

STAFF COLONEL GENERAL NIKLAUS JAGER

Chief Communications Officer, Swiss Armed Forces

THE PHILIPPINES

COLONEL ROMMEL K TELLO

Commandant, Special Intelligence Training School, ISAFP

COLONEL NORWYN ROMEO P TOLENTINO

Chief, Operations and Intelligence Division

TIMOR-LESTE

MAJOR HELDER DA COSTA

2nd Commander (2IC) Land Component

UNITED KINGDOM

COMMANDER DEREK RAE

International Policy and Planning, Asia Pacific 3, MOD

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

COLONEL ROBERT TREY MEEKS III

Chief, Office of Defence Cooperation

About the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies

The Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS) is a key research component of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS). It focuses on defence and security research to serve national needs. IDSS faculty and research staff conducts both academic and policy-oriented research on security-related issues and developments affecting Southeast Asia and the Asia Pacific. IDSS is divided into three research clusters: (i) The Asia Pacific cluster – comprising the China, South Asia, United States, and Regional Security Architecture programmes; (ii) The Malay Archipelago cluster – comprising the Indonesia and Malaysia programmes; and (iii) The Military and Security cluster – comprising the Military Transformations, Maritime Security, and Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (HADR) programmes. Finally, the Military Studies Programme, the wing that provides military education, is also a part of IDSS.

For more information, please visit www.rsis.edu.sg/research/idss.

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.

