

## Defence is a trust not a cash cow

Since Kevin Rudd assumed the federal leadership of the Labor Party at the end of 2006 we have seen a pronounced move to fresh thinking on defence issues within Labor circles. Coincidentally, or probably not, there has also been increased bipartisan agreement on strategic policy and defence capability development generally.

In an election year, of course, both sides of politics are prone to deny such convergence when seeking to differentiate their product electorally, but many partisan disagreements on defence are really more apparent than real.

Labor's new leadership seems to have absorbed significant lessons from the Mark Latham debacle. The 2004 election was largely lost because the electorate looked beyond the hype and sensed things it distrusted in a potential prime-minister. Not least of these concerned national defence, where most voters of all hues disagreed with Latham's old-fashioned, virulent anti-Americanism, his boorish contempt for those undertaking military service, and his shoot-from-the-hip style of decision-making on military-strategic issues.

More recently, continuing strategic uncertainty, the necessary rebuilding of the ADF after decades of comparative neglect, and the generational move from Beazley to Rudd have all contributed to defence policy reform within Labor. In particular, the ALP has been able to shed the personal history, shibboleths and outmoded theories of the late Cold-War era that kept Kim Beazley in thrall long after the international strategic situation had moved on.

While there is little doubt Kevin Rudd has modern, balanced and shrewd general instincts where defence strategy is concerned, some unease persists about others in Labor's leadership group. Fears remain that some Labor parliamentarians are still infected with the simplistic defence-of-Australia dogma or harbour fantasies about renewing rampant bureaucratic managerialism at Russell Offices.

Well, we will know soon enough if or when Labor wins this year's election – an event likely to be decided anyway on social and economic issues alone. Defence issues will sway even fewer votes, either way, this time around, due in part to Labor's fresh thinking.

But whichever side of politics assumes government, Australia will still face one serious and long-term threat to effective defence planning and adequate resourcing. Governments of both political persuasions are now addicted electorally to the ever-greater diversion of federal resources to areas of social and infrastructure spending that are the constitutional responsibility of the states and territories.

But the defence of Australia, its people and its interests will always be a wholly federal responsibility – and one needing long-term and diligent attention. The ever-increasing diversion of federal revenues to areas of spending formerly the exclusive or primary responsibility of the states (and to middle-class welfare) is inevitably affecting the funds considered politically available to ensure our common defence. This short-sighted policy must change.

To many voters (and indeed many politicians) defence is an issue that barely enters their day-to-day consciousness. When it does, the instinctive reaction of many is to try and avoid thinking about it because it might be unpleasant, difficult or require complex moral and intellectual choices.

### contents

#### Comment and Information

Leading Article	1
Letters	2
Current Comment	6
Major Furphy	11
The Sharp End	30
Association Update	35
Conference Calendar	34
Subscriptions and Privacy Policy	10

#### Articles

Australian defence spending: As good as it gets?		
	<i>Mark Thomson</i>	12
Fresh ideas for future challenges	<i>Kevin Rudd</i>	15
Themistocles: Ancient thinking all at sea	<i>Paul Monk</i>	20
The Sea-based Commonwealth	<i>Norman Friedman</i>	24
Australia's oil security	<i>Michael Richardson</i>	26
Recognising Australian peacekeeping	<i>Tim Ford</i>	28
Tank operations in modern counter-insurgency warfare	<i>Andrew Erskine</i>	30
The Super Hornet purchase: A good save to a poor plan?	<i>Robert Marlow</i>	32

#### Reviews

25 April 1915: The Day the ANZAC Legend was Born	<i>Glenn Wahlert</i>	36
Backs to the Wall: A Larrikin on the Western Front	<i>Dr Michael Tyquin</i>	37
The Torch and the Sword: A History of the Army Cadet Movement in Australia	<i>Dr Jean Bou</i>	38
A Critical Vulnerability: The Impact of the Submarine Threat on Australia's Maritime Defence 1915-1954	<i>Ric Pelvin</i>	39
Detainee 002: The Case of David Hicks	<i>Neil James</i>	40
The Defence Theory of Relativity	<i>Dr Mark Thomson</i>	41
Power, Faith and Fantasy: America in the Middle East 1776 to the Present	<i>Ric Smith</i>	42
Unintended Consequences: The United States at War	<i>Jamie Cullens</i>	44

#### Our cover

*Reconstruction Task Force troops construct an Afghan National Police post in Oruzgan Province despite two Taliban attacks during the six-day task.*

*Photo courtesy of the ADF*

A related phenomenon is the commonplace assumption that *someone else* is no doubt worrying about it so why bother.

Labor's promise to quarantine defence spending from any post-election razor gang is a realistic admission that Australia cannot repeat the prolonged neglect of defence investment during the 1980s and 1990s under governments of both political persuasions. Indeed the current boost to defence spending is mainly to cancel out those decades of sustained under-investment.

No matter which party forms the next government, they must make sure the Australian people realise that any cutting back on needed defence spending to satisfy short-term social desires, or arrange political fixes, means the current generation is selfishly gambling with the security of their children and grandchildren. ♦