



Royal United Services Institute of Western Australia

## Newsletter

May 2012

*Promoting National Security and Defence*

Patron: His Excellency Mr Malcolm McCusker AO, QC  
Governor of Western Australia  
President: Colonel Mike Brennan  
Secretary: Commander Otto Pelczar, RFD, RD, RANR (ret)

RUSI of WA, Leeuwin Barracks, Riverside Road, East Fremantle  
Postal Address: C/- Department of Defence, Locked Bag 5001,  
Fremantle, WA, 6160

### *In this Newsletter*

**April Lecture Report – Land Combat Vehicle System**

**Follow Up Discussion on March Force Structure Review Lecture**

**Monthly Program**

**Blamey Oration – 24 May 2012  
Duncan Lewis AO, DSC, CSC Secretary of Defence**

**Field Marshall Sir Thomas Blamey and the Blamey Oration**

**State Schools and ANZAC Day in WA - 1925**

The regular program of Lectures is now in place. Please note the dates in your diaries to avoid disappointment. There are no further Luncheon discussions planned until later in the year. Please note the date of the AGM in August.

#### **Subscriptions:**

**Subscriptions are due on 1 July annually**

**Town - \$40, Country - \$25, Associate - \$5**

Your subscription, and other charges can be electronically transferred to the RUSI.

**BSB 803-205, Account No 20531718, and include your surname**

**April Lecture Report – Land Combat Vehicle System**

Brigadier Nagy Sorial, the Director General Combined Arms Fighting System and Program Manager Land 400, Land Combat Vehicle System, delivered the April lecture. During the lecture, Brigadier Sorial outlined the intent of the Land 400 Land Combat Vehicle System (LCVS) to provide the mounted close combat capability for the Land Force as well as being the lead project for integration within the Combined Arms Fighting System (CAFS). He stressed that Land 400 was not a vehicle replacement project.

A Combined Arms Fighting System (CAFS) is an organisation that contains, or is able to draw on, those force elements, systems and platforms, that are necessary to fulfil the range of combat functions. CAFS will deliver integrated combined arms teams (CAT) capable of conducting Close Combat and of enabling Joint Land Combat by 2030. By its nature a CAFS is a temporary organisation that only exists for a specified operation or mission.

The LCVS will provide the mounted close combat capability within the Combined Arms Fighting System (CAFS) . The LCVS will be able to be employed across the full spectrum of conflict in all environments up to and including close combat as part of the combined arms team (CAT). LCVS will be capable of integration with legacy and new equipments in order to contribute to the overall commanders' situational awareness and combat power as part of a networked capability. LCVS will be characterised by precision lethality, land combat survivability, situational awareness and combat capability integration to deliver a system that enables the successful conduct of sustained close combat against emerging and future threats.

Because Land 400 is a work in progress, Brigadier Nagy did not leave lecture notes for his talk but referred members to the web pages. The current status of the project and related project developments can be found on the Land 400 web site:

<http://www.defence.gov.au/dmo/lsd/land400>

Industry or media inquiries can be directed to Ms Helen Ward – Senior Advisor Industry and Media

Phone - +61 3 9282 4547

Fax- +61 3 9282 7181

Email – [helen.ward3@defence.gov.au](mailto:helen.ward3@defence.gov.au)

[Return to Page One](#)

### Comments on Force Structure Review Lecture

Member **Norman Ashworth** submitted the following comments in a Letter to the Editor:

I attended and enjoyed the lively discussion of the Force Structure Review at the RUSI presented by Major General Michael Crane, Head Force Structure Review at Leeuwin Barracks on Thursday 8 March. As a long time student of Defence strategic issues, I offer the following comments on issues raised during the lecture for ongoing discussion by RUSI members.

During question time, in answer to a question on the future submarines, General Crane posed the rhetorical question: "What do we want submarines for; what do we want them to do?" This would seem to me to be a fundamental question for a force structure review, not only about the future submarines, but about all elements of the ADF, both existing and proposed. The question of where one might find an answer remains open. Certainly it is not to be found in Force 2030, or at least not in the unclassified version that is available to us lesser mortals outside Defence.

Force 2030, like its many predecessors, has a gap in the logic of the development of its argument. In Chapter 7 the ADF's principle task, "to deter and defeat armed attacks on Australia" (7.2) is set down, together with the military strategy envisaged to meet that task.

Chapter 8 mentions a "force structure review (which) examined plausible defence planning contingencies" (8.2). This review and the contingencies used are, for valid security reasons, not included in the White Paper, thus leaving a critical gap for the reader who does not have the appropriate security clearance. Chapter 9 goes on to list the various new capabilities required, without explanation as to the why and wherefore, and without reference to current capabilities and how they might contribute.

To me, the question is not: "What do we want the future submarines (or other defence capability) for?" but rather: what (military) capabilities are required to be able to deter and defeat an armed attack on Australia; how might a submarine contribute; what specific capabilities would such a submarine require; what number of boats would be viable and affordable; and, are there alternative capabilities that could more efficiently carry out the task?

At this point two issues arise. The first relates to the wording of the principle task:

- The phrase "deter and defeat" appears illogical. If you have to defeat an enemy attack, then clearly your deterrent has failed; if your deterrent is successful, then there is no question of you having to defeat the enemy. Of the two, to deter is far preferable than having to defeat. My wording of the principle task would go something like this: "preferably to deter, but if not then to defeat, an armed attack on Australia".
- There are two, quite distinct, forms of deterrence. The offensive deterrent comes from the Cold War where a nuclear deterrent was a threat to utterly destroy your enemy if he tried to destroy you. It was called, for very good reason, MAD. The defensive deterrent, on the other hand, is having strong enough defences to make a potential enemy think twice before attacking you. The oft maligned "Defence of Australia" strategy was based on a defensive deterrent.

- The level of armed attack is not specified. Presumably we are talking here of a substantive attack by an organised military force, not an attack by a few terrorists, armed to the teeth though they may be.

The second issue is that the White Paper sets out a principle task (defer and defeat an armed attack) and a number of subsidiary tasks, some military in nature, others not so, such as: supporting domestic security; contributing to stability in the South Pacific and East Timor; contributing to military contingencies in the Asia-Pacific region; supporting global security; and, humanitarian assistance. RUSI members could rightly ask whether the Force Structure Review distinguish between capabilities needed for the principle task, and capabilities relevant only to the secondary tasks?

Earlier I mentioned the “Defence of Australia” strategy. Some defence commentators claim that that strategy is now “dead and buried”. It is publicly known, for example, many senior Army officers were strongly opposed to it on the, grossly mistaken, belief that the only role for Army in it was to “clean up the stragglers” who managed to get through the Navy and Air Force controlled sea-air gap to the north of Australia. To me the Army has a vital role to play in the strategy, by setting the size of the (land) force that the enemy would have to send across the sea-air gap, thus contributing significantly to the (defensive) deterrent value of the strategy. In the White Paper I can see elements of the classic “Defence of Australia” strategy, but also elements, such as pre-emptive strike well beyond Australia’s shores, that go beyond the strategy as originally postulated. Personally, I prefer the classic version, and have doubts as to the wisdom of such things as pre-emptive strike well beyond Australia’s shores. It would be informative to know if Defence has a current view on the “Defence of Australia” strategy?

I would be interested if any members share my concerns or have other issues relating to the Force Structure Review.

***The Editor would be pleased to receive and publish your thoughts on issues raised in the Lecture or Norman’s letter.***

[Return to Page One](#)

## 2012 PROGRAM

<b>MAY</b>	
8 May	There will be no luncheon discussion in May
24 May	Blamey Oration – Mr Duncan Lewis, Secretary Department of Defence
<b>JUNE</b>	
28 June	Evening Discussion – Afghanistan: Was (Is) It Worth It?
<b>AUGUST</b>	
14 Aug	Annual General meeting (Luncheon)
<b>SEPTEMBER</b>	
20-21 Sep	RUSI National Council Meeting in Western Australia

**Blamey Oration – 24 May 2012**  
**Duncan Lewis AO, DSC, CSC Secretary of Defence**

**BLAMEY ORATOR****Duncan Lewis AO, DSC, CSC  
Secretary of Defence (SECDEF)**

Duncan Lewis is the Secretary of the Department of Defence. Building on almost four decades of experience in the defence and national security communities, he commenced in this role on 5 September 2011.

Born in 1953, Duncan joined the Australian Army after schooling in Western Australia, graduating from the Royal Military College, Duntroon in 1975. A career in the military, spanning 33 years, followed. During this time Duncan commenced in the Special Air Service Regiment and rose to the rank of Major General. He was awarded the Conspicuous Service Cross for his service in East Timor and appointed as an Officer of the Order of Australia for his service in command of Australian Special Forces.



In 2005, Duncan left the military and joined the public service. His initial appointment was as First Assistant Secretary of the National Security Division within the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. Later that year, he was promoted to Deputy Secretary and shortly after, he was appointed as an Associate Secretary. Here he led the National Security and International Policy Group and contributed to the Department's broader leadership as a member of its Executive. He served as the Chair of the Board of the National Security College and as an ex officio member of the Council of the Order of Australia and the National Australia Day Committee.

From December 2008, Duncan served as Australia's inaugural National Security Adviser. Duncan was the Prime Minister's principal source of advice on all national security matters. He had responsibility for the strategic leadership of the national security community, as well as the coordination of national security policy development and crisis response.

Duncan is a graduate of the British Army Staff College, Camberley and the United States Army War College. He holds a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of NSW and a Graduate Diploma in Defence Studies and Management from Deakin University. He is fluent in Indonesian.

Duncan is married to Jenny, and they have two children, Simon and Alison. His interests include classical music, history, Australian Rules football and tennis.

[Return to Page One](#)

## Field Marshall Sir Thomas Blamey and the Blamey Oration

The Royal United Services Institute of Western Australia presents the Blamey Oration annually in conjunction with the Field Marshall Sir Thomas Blamey Memorial Fund. This oration marks the 61st anniversary of the death of the Field Marshall on 27 May 1951. The orator is presented with a medallion on behalf of the Field Marshall Sir Thomas Blamey Memorial Fund.



Field Marshall Sir Thomas Albert Blamey, GBE, KCB, CMG, DSO, ED was the only Australian ever to attain the rank of field marshal. Blamey joined the Australian Army as a regular soldier in 1906, and attended the Staff College at Quetta. During the First World War he landed at Anzac Cove on 25 April 1915, and served as a staff officer in the Gallipoli Campaign, where he was mentioned in despatches for a daring raid behind enemy lines. He later served on the Western Front, where he distinguished himself in the planning for the Battle of Pozières. He rose to the rank of brigadier general, and served as chief of staff of the Australian Corps under Lieutenant General Sir John Monash, who credited him as a factor in the Corps' success in the Battles of Hamel, Amiens and the Hindenburg Line.

After the war Blamey was Deputy Chief of the General Staff, and was involved in the creation of the Royal Australian Air Force. He resigned from the regular Army in 1925 to become Chief Commissioner of the Victoria Police. As Chief Commissioner, Blamey set about dealing with the grievances that had led to the 1923 Victorian Police strike, and implemented innovations such as police dogs and equipping vehicles with radios. His tenure as Chief Commissioner was marred by a scandal in which his police badge was found in a brothel, and a later attempt to cover up the shooting of a police officer led to his forced resignation in 1936. Appointed chairman of the Commonwealth Government's Manpower Committee and Controller General of Recruiting in 1938, he headed a successful recruiting campaign which doubled the size of the part-time volunteer Militia.

During the Second World War he commanded the Second Australian Imperial Force and the I Corps in the Middle East. In the latter role he commanded Australian and Commonwealth troops in the disastrous Battle of Greece. In the former role, he attempted to protect Australian interests against British commanders who sought to disperse his forces. He was appointed Deputy Commander in Chief in the Middle East, and was promoted to general in 1941. In 1942, he returned to Australia as Commander in Chief of the Australian Military Forces and Commander of Allied Land Forces in the South West Pacific Area under the command of General Douglas MacArthur.

He assumed personal command of New Guinea Force during the Kokoda Track Campaign, and relieved Lieutenant General Sydney Rowell and Major General Arthur Allen under controversial circumstances. During the Salamaua–Lae Campaign Blamey planned and executed a major and victorious campaign. Nonetheless, during the final campaigns of the war he faced vociferous criticism of the Army's performance. He signed the instrument of surrender on behalf of Australia at Japan's ceremonial surrender in Tokyo Bay on 2 September 1945, and later personally accepted the Japanese surrender at Morotai. He was promoted to field marshal in June 1950.

[Return to Page One](#)

**State Schools and ANZAC Day in WA - 1925**

*This topical article by Mr Peter Hopper, President of the Shenton Park RSL Sub Branch, reminds us that debate on curriculum, commemoration and our attitudes to defence and security is ongoing.*

On 16 March 1925 the Minister for Education in the WA Labor Government, Mr JM Drew, announced that the customary addresses to children in State Schools by returned servicemen or persons other than teachers for ANZAC Day would not be permitted this year. He pointed out the government had been prompted towards taking this action following a large deputation that confronted him in September 1924. This deputation representing ten different organisations passionately pleaded that he take steps to banish militarism from the curriculum in the State Schools. It also wanted Mr Drew to provide such literature as would create in the pupils a love of peace and a loathing of war.

The deputation comprised representatives from the following organizations: Women's Service Guild, National Council of Women, Women's Christian Temperance Union, the State Labour movement, Congregational Church, Methodist Church, Church of England, Labour Women's Organisation, Little Citizens League and the League of Nations Union. This representation no doubt opened the wounds of the conscription debates of 1916 and 1917.

In support of his stance, Mr Drew referred to a recent speeches delivered by Sir Talbot Hobbs and Prime Minister SM Bruce on 14 March in Perth. Sir Talbot Hobbs had denounced the concept of the Washington Naval agreement claiming that the recent sinking of HMAS Australia was simply a hypocritical compliance with its provisions. Mr Drew used this comment to ask: "Is this the style of utterance which was contemplated for the forthcoming ANZAC Day?" Mr Drew labeled the contents of Mr Bruce's speech as intangible, vapoury, militaristic platitudes, the usual stock-in-trade of the war party.

Opposition to Mr Drew's decision was quickly aroused. The Returned Soldiers League (RSL) was the first out of the blocks. It requested a meeting with the Acting Premier, Mr Angwin, to ask for a reversal of the interdict. The Victorian Branch of the RSL telegraphed the Prime Minister the following day expressing its concerns that the interdict would prevent references to the deeds of the ANZACs at Gallipoli. At Wagin the PM then received another telegram from a group of businessmen in Sydney who opposed the ban. The implication was made that by not allowing outsiders to speak in State Schools on ANZAC Day, patriotic ideals would be cast aside. A gathering of fruit growers and other interested individuals gathered in Armidale to voice their objections. Similar meetings were held in Katanning, Kalgoorlie and at Northam to protest against this action of the Labor Cabinet. Other RSL Sub Branches to respond negatively to the government ban were Subiaco and Midland Junction. Some groups, however, actively supported the government's decision. The Perth Branch of the Amalgamated Engineering Union congratulated the government's response to what it felt was the reckless speeches of Sir Talbot Hobbs, the Prime Minister and others.

On 18 March, at a meeting of the WA State executive of the RSL, the issue was hotly debated. The State President, Rabbi Freedman, did well to keep the hotheads at bay. The general opinion of the meeting was that no soldier would wish to glorify war. In the end a resolution was passed that deplored the actions of the State Government and requested the Acting Premier to receive a deputation from the executive with a view to reversing such decision or making such modifications thereto as may be acceptable to

the RSL.

Mr John Nicholson MLC, who had introduced the deputation to Mr Drew in September 1924, then wrote to *The West Australian* to dispute the fact that mention was made by the various bodies at the time, to suggest that addresses to the children in State Schools on ANZAC Day should be prohibited. He concluded by asking the Government to reconsider and reverse its decision. Mr Drew refused to back down on his original stance, insisting that only teachers throughout the State would be permitted to address their students at ANZAC Day services. He maintained that this would mean that such addresses would be more widespread than usual.

The meeting between the RSL and the Acting Premier took place on 21 March. Mr WC Angwin told the delegation from the RSL that his Government never intended that the occasion should not be fittingly observed in the schools. The government merely wanted to prevent unrestricted addresses leading to the glorification of war rather than the blessings of peace. Rabbi Freedman, the State President of the RSL, pointed out that such visits to schools had begun well before 1915. They began as part of the observance of Empire Day (24 May). The RSL, therefore, merely wanted to maintain this custom.

Mr Angwin then produced a copy of a prepared statement issued by the Education Department on the conduct of ANZAC Day for 1925. In this the Government considered that it would be far better for the teachers to address the children on ANZAC Day than for outsiders to do so as they were better qualified to make suitable addresses from an educational standpoint. He regretted that an attempt should be made to make the matter of political significance. He strongly put the point that there had never been any suggestion that addresses would be totally banned. In the end the State Labor government refused to remove the ban on allowing outsiders to address students.

This response from the government put an end to the debate. On 3 April the government then published the details of their instructions to schools once again to avoid any misapprehensions. On Friday 24th April 1925 ANZAC Day services were conducted in government schools throughout Western Australia without returned servicemen addressing the students. The morning was given to regular work while the ANZAC Day services commenced at 11 am. Addresses were given by teachers in no way exulting militarism. One of the suitable hymns suggested was "Give to us Peace in Our Time, O Lord". Children were also made to salute the flag before the singing of the National Anthem, "God Save The King". The *West Australian* reported that "As a result of the prohibition imposed by the State Government, the usual speeches by public men were omitted, but in other respects the observances were the same as in former years, addresses being delivered by the headmasters, and patriotic lessons being read, the sounding of the 'Last Post' at midday ending the ceremonies".

In non-government schools returned servicemen were, however, invited to address the students and many did so. At Perth Girls College, Mr McDonald, who served with the Light Horse in Palestine, addressed the girls with Mr Benson (State Secretary of the RSL) who had served in France. No doubt many other returned servicemen addressed students in non-government schools in WA on that same day.

It is interesting to note that it was a Labor Government under Geoff Gallop that introduced legislation in 2004 making it compulsory for government schools in WA to conduct ANZAC Day services. The Valuing Our Veterans and Saluting Their Service programs initiated by the Department of Veterans Affairs of today also stands in stark

contrast to the prohibition imposed in 1925. Today returned servicemen are welcomed overwhelmingly into government schools to address students. We have come a long way from the days when it was feared by a state government that war was going to be glorified to the detriment of our students. I doubt whether the 1925 Labor government in WA would have objected to the aims of today's Saluting Their Service program: To ensure that ANZAC Day is recognised and commemorated in an appropriate and respectful manner.

*The original formatting of this article was extensively referenced to the West Australian, 18, 20, 23 and 25 March and 3 and 25 April 1925.*

[Return to Page One](#)

**STAY INFORMED:**

Visit the RUSI Website: <https://www.rusi.org.au/index.php>