2017 is shaping to be a watershed year for Command and Staff College with a number of significant developments underway. The first of these has been the decision to change the focus of our Teaching Fellow positions to better align with College programmes. By way of background, for the past ten years the CSC Teaching Fellows’ primary role has been to teach a number of defence and security papers at Massey University, a role which also included working with students on the Advanced Command and Staff Course (ACSC). In 2016, however, it was decided that this role should change, to one of providing direct support to CSC programmes.

In making this significant change, we are seeking to develop an integrated CSC faculty, with two parallel streams which flow in the same direction: a military faculty (comprising Directing Staff) and an academic faculty (comprising Teaching Fellows). These two streams will work collegially, to provide more robust programmes and a more holistic learning experience for all our students.

Although we are still in the early stages of implementation, the change is already having a number of positive effects. The Directing Staff and students have benefited from having an in-house academic capability available, and having the linkages between different components of the programme better articulated and more clearly understood. The Teaching Fellows have also led the development of a new College ‘philosophy’ on Critical, Creative and Reflective Thinking, which will underpin all CSC programmes in future.

The second development involves the tertiary programme which accompanies the ACSC. For the past twenty years, the ACSC programme has included Masters-level papers provided by Massey University, leading to the award of a Postgraduate Diploma or (since 2015) Masters degree upon successful completion of the course. As part of the ongoing development of the ACSC, the tertiary programme itself is currently being reviewed, and a number of New Zealand providers are being invited to tender for the opportunity to provide the programme. Regardless of the outcome of the tender process, we are confident that the result will be a high-quality academic programme which supports and compliments the ACSC experience and assists our students as they take on new roles after graduation.

These developments, and the decisions made around them, will do much to shape our future success. This is an interesting stage in our College’s journey and I must acknowledge the ongoing commitment of my staff as we work through it together.
In May, I had the privilege of launching the newest offering from Massey University Press, *Army Fundamentals: From Making Soldiers to the Limits of the Military Instrument*, during a small function at Massey’s Wellington campus. Edited by Associate Professor Beth Greener, this multi-disciplinary collection of essays provides a unique insight into the New Zealand Army as an organisation, the individuals who serve in it, and the complex issues and challenges impacting on the use of military force in modern conflict resolution.

Dr Nina Harding and Maike Guesgen examine the acculturisation and induction process through an anthropological lens. Their contributions highlight the different experiences of new recruits in full-immersion induction programmes such as Basic Training at The Army Depot on the one hand, and an atypical, blended programme (the former Kippenberger university-based Scheme) on the other, and show how these different experiences could produce entirely different results.

The chapters by Samantha Morris, Dr Peter Greener and Dr Michael Lauren look at the issues around the identity of the New Zealand soldier: how they see themselves, how they perceive how others see them, and how they are really seen by others. Although the resulting picture is generally complimentary to the New Zealand soldier, the three chapters do sound a number of cautionary notes.

The first of these is the requirement to understand the difference between *cultural appreciation* and *cultural competence*. The evidence suggests that while most New Zealand soldiers have the former almost by instinct, the latter is more difficult to attain, and indeed must be developed via a conscious, deliberate process. The development of cultural competence must be a key part of Army personnel capability development planning in future.

**Review by LTCOL Richard Taylor**

New book launched on 9 May 2017 promises to be an interesting read.

Editor: Associate Professor Beth Greener
The second cautionary note involves the inherent conflict between the generalist versus specialist approach which might occasionally stretch the resource and/or technical capabilities of our personnel on operations. This, again, provides a challenge for the senior leadership of the New Zealand Army, the NZDF, and our political masters. It is a challenge that deserves its own debate.

Kiri Stevens and Beth Greener’s case study of the RAMSI deployment to Solomon Islands examines the impact of that deployment on the personnel concerned, in terms of how they interacted with the operational settings, how they understood their roles and work in the context of those settings, how they saw the impact of their involvement in the deployment, and what the experience meant for their understanding of their identity and values. The chapter also addresses issues of gender in the military.

LTCOL Jane Derbyshire explores the gender theme further, by running a tape-measure over the current state of the Army’s moves towards gender integration, and what she calls the development of the ‘modern warrior’.

Although New Zealand has been a leader in this regard, much still remains to be done. The potential benefits, however, are significant.

LTCOL Josh Wineera examines the New Zealand Army’s involvement in Building Partner Capacity (BPC) programmes. He discusses how the New Zealand Army has changed the way it conducts such missions, blending contemporary adult teaching and learning methodology with the characteristics of the New Zealand soldier to produce a unique approach to BPC.

In the final chapter, Bill Fish, Beth Greener, Nina Harding and Cameron Sigley bring together the range of themes which have been explored throughout the book to make a number of salient observations about the limits of military action. Some of these observations challenge current thinking, such as the idea that highly-trained war fighters make better peacekeepers. The authors highlight a particular challenge for the senior leadership of both the Army and the NZDF: that as the senior military advisers to government, they must intimately understand their organisations; and must be prepared to represent to government when their organisations are exhausted, or have reached the limit of their military capability and capacity. It is, in every sense, the capstone chapter of the book, and brings the earlier themes together wonderfully well.

Army Fundamentals is a valuable piece of work. I commend it to anyone with an interest in the New Zealand Army, and those who chose to serve in its ranks.

Associate Professor Beth Greener at the book launch with publicist, Nicola Legat from Massey University Press.
In August 2016 the Centre for Defence and Security Studies at Massey University hosted the inaugural New Zealand National Security Conference at its Albany Campus which was attended by senior New Zealand security officials and a variety of academics and social commentators. This book is a result of the discourse which occurred between those with the weighty responsibility for directing and enacting national security and those tasked with critically engaging with, and educating civil society on the security field. Its fifteen chapters are written by a variety of experts representing a wide range of voices thinking about security from multiple viewpoints. Chapter authors include leaders in directing national security, regional and domestic thinkers, technical experts, practitioner scholars, current and former NZDF employees, as well as, emerging and critical voices.

The book begins with an overview of New Zealand’s national security as it is constructed geographically, historically and politically. It argues that national security is something which we actively construct. Security or even insecurity is not a thing which exists in and of itself. Rather, national security (and threats to that security) are constructed within a specific national history, a regional context and a complex ongoing negotiation of relationships and scarce resources. One tension evident in the book is the difference in approaches to understanding security between scholars and security practitioners. While for scholars, the concept of national security is problematic, governments do not have such a luxury. For the New Zealand Government, the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet (DPMC) defines National Security as “…the condition which permits the citizens of a state to go about their daily business confidently free from fear…”

The enactment of national security therefore requires the State to protect its citizenry against the risks and threats which might impede the definition. DPMC argues that the risks to New Zealand security are driven by 1) societal pressures 2) economic risks 3) environmental hazards 4) security trends and 5) technological challenges. As such, the book’s chapters explore New Zealand’s security with a particular attention to this definition and set of risk drivers.

The first section, *International, regional and subregional security trends*, discusses how New Zealand’s national security is constructed within its regional context. Specifically, the Asia Pacific context with focus on regional security and strategy (Rouben Azizian), the South China Sea (Aileen San Pablo Baviera) and the Pacific Islands (Anna Powles). These chapters also discuss the transnational impact of cyberthreats (Tang Lan) and the political philosophy of modern security challenges to state politics (Negar Partow).

Section two, *New Zealand’s emerging security challenges*, begins with Howard Broad’s reflections on the National Security System, before our contributors move to discuss New Zealand’s economic security in terms of our international relations (Steve Hoadley) and our border practices (Germana Nicklin). Chapters 9 and 10 discuss the challenge of integrating military capability into whole of government approaches to security in terms of maritime surveillance (Brian Oliver and John Moremon) and special operations forces (Miriam Wharton and Rhys Ball).

---

2 Ibid.
The third and final section, *Issues in New Zealand Security*, starts with the premise that if national security is something which we construct then it can be challenged and changed. The section critically explores national security coordination (Terry Johansen), the view that terrorism has never occurred in New Zealand (John Battersby) and outlaw motorcycle gangs (Carl Bradley). The book concludes by exploring the relationships between security research (William Hoverd) and the university (Damien Rogers) and it ultimately ends by exploring the overarching themes which will impact thinking about New Zealand’s national security in the future (Nick Nelson).

For current and former students of the New Zealand Defence Force Advanced Command and Staff College (Joint) reading the book offers two distinct opportunities. First, it provides an overview of the field of New Zealand’s national security as a whole. It creates a national discussion of security where defence is understood to be only one part of a larger structure of state security. Second, it offers an opportunity to read contemporary research and critical thinking on national security emerging from many of the scholars and security practitioners who will be speaking to, teaching into and leading various aspects of the 2017 NZDF ACSC(J) program of studies.

As such, it should offer opportunity for broader discussion of ideas between the students who are responsible for leading the development and enactment of New Zealand’s security and those who are tasked for commenting upon and critiquing their practice.

Overall, the book indicates that it is important to remember that national security is enacted in order to address complex threats and uncertain risks. As such, it is a significant multi-faceted challenge which is constructed in the light of political, resource and technical constraints, and therefore the field requires understanding, engagement and critique. The authors show that the future direction of national security action, legislation and discourse is a shared concern of security scholars, government and the New Zealand public, all of whom need to consider, and ultimately decide upon, what sort of country they want to live in and the extent to which their government should secure the integrity of the nation. The volume’s contributors offer the reader a chance to reflect upon how a deeper understanding of various relevant security issues might inform broader whole-of-society conversations around the future of national security.

Ultimately, the book argues that a whole-of-society discussion of our national security environment, will impact on New Zealand’s national identity and asks us to better understand ourselves.
In July 1914 the euphoric response to the declaration of war was widespread and millions on both sides looked forward to a war that ‘would be over by Christmas’. Almost exactly three years later, when millions had perished and any hopes of a quick war had been ruined on the battlefields of Gallipoli, the Somme, Verdun and the Brusilov Offensive, another campaign was launched in the west.

Near the Belgian town of Ypres huge numbers of Allied troops were amassed in order to break through German lines. Reasons for attacking in this particular area were its proximity to the railway junction at Roulers (vital for supplying Germany’s 4th Army), control of ridges to the south and east of Ypres (which were determined as important goals earlier in 1917) and the desire to capture the U-boat pens on the Belgian coast, thereby dealing a major blow to that threat.

Although hopes were high before the battle was joined, these were literally and figuratively bogged down as some early successes were soon offset by determined German defences. Unseasonably heavy rain in August, coupled with the effects of intense bombardment, turned the entire area into a quagmire. The mud was so deep that men, horses and equipment were on occasion swallowed whole, never to be seen again. The weather continued to be a significant factor as the campaign dragged on into September and October, resulting in the names of Ypres, Flanders and Passchendaele forever being linked to mud and misery.
New Zealand’s involvement began on 12 October 1917, when, with other Allied troops, they attacked German positions near Passchendaele. The result was a disaster and the Allies suffered 13,000 casualties. Of these, 2,735 were New Zealanders, of whom 845 were killed, thereby earning the dubious distinction as being the worst loss of life in a single day in this nation’s post-1840 history.

The weather remained so bad that General Haig called off any further attacks until it improved, a decision which led to the Second Battle of Passchendaele two weeks later. This time the Canadians led and they eventually captured the village.

The Ypres campaign has become synonymous with the horrors of war, with approximately 520,000 casualties between all combatants. Yet, although the Allies did not capture the U-boat pens and lost any gains after Germany’s Ludendorff Offensive in March 1918, the cost to the German side was so high that it undermined their ability to replace their losses. The Allies, however, saw the entry of American troops into the war for the first time as well as a continued stream of men and supplies from the Commonwealth.

New Zealand’s links to Flanders, Ypres and Passchendaele remain strong because so many of its men are buried there and many more lie where they fell in unmarked and unknown graves.

As the words of a modern-day poem say:

I write this now so in years to come,
you’ll know about this day.
The world will know of Passchendaele,
and of the price we paid.

(A. Thomas Hawkins).

William Edward Buckingham, No. 36403, the author’s great-great uncle. ‘Bill’ Buckingham was one of c.15,000 NZ troops who fought at Passchendaele.

The Tyne Cot Memorial near West-Vlaanderen, Belgium.
For the last three years I had the privilege – and pleasure – of serving as the NZDF ‘exchange’ officer on staff at the Australian Defence Force’s Centre for Defence and Strategic Studies (CDSS) at Weston Creek in Canberra. The ‘flagship’ course of CDSS is the one-year residential Defence and Strategic Studies Course (DSSC (Residential)), at COL(E) rank level, for which I was a Syndicate Director (the CDSS term for a DS). The NZDF routinely sends two ‘students’ on the DSSC(R) each year.

There are a number of similarities between the Advanced Command and Staff Course (Joint) – ACSC(J) at NZDF CSC and DSSC (R) at CDSS, such as ‘staff-student’ peer facilitation of learning, the culture of the adult learning environment and course size - certainly in comparison to many overseas staff courses, plus the emphasis placed on international engagement. Indeed, a rewarding feature of DSSC(R) 2016 was meeting up again with, now, Captain Chayakorn ‘Greg’ Panlar of the Royal Thai Navy, who attended NZDF CSC in 2004. There are, however, some distinct differences between ACSC(J) and the DSSC(R).

First, there is the level itself of Joint Professional Military Learning (JPML) offered on DSSC(R). This results, for example, in the ‘big school’ version of the Joint Operations Planning Course being more about ‘picturing success’ in an inter-agency context and understanding factors influencing the determination of end-states, than the staff processes used to achieve them. Second, there is the inclusion of a module (or ‘unit’ in CDSS parlance) dedicated to capability development. Third, the academic component of DSSC(R) is not delivered by the university service provider, although it does provide the academic marking function. Rather, the course is developed internally, delivered with the assistance of external expertise (as at NZDF CSC) and accredited to a university (Deakin University). Fourth, senior mentors are used to supplement and extend peer-facilitated learning. Fifth, there is no requirement for students on DSSC(R) to enrol in a university-accredited programme of study and, for those who elect to do so, there is a range of qualification options available, from a postgraduate certificate through various Masters’ papers – including an MBA – up to PhD candidature.
A ‘distance-learning’ version of DSSC(R) is also being developed, titled DSSC (Flexible), to make available the learning opportunities of the course to a wider audience of domestic and international officers and officials.

Another difference between NZDF CSC and CDSS is that the latter has a broader span of responsibility than delivery of JPML. CDSS has oversight of two related directorates: Defence Leadership and Ethics (DLE) and Defence Research & Publications (DR&P). DLE focuses on military leadership and ethics education and so has similarities with NZDF’s Institute for Leadership Development. DR&P aims to ‘promote rigorous research, analysis and publishing, in order to contribute to strategic and defence policy, capability and operation’ (CDSS Handbook, 2017, p. 21). Its publications include the well-known Australian Defence Force Journal and two edited collations of student papers: Indo-Pacific Strategic Digest and Indo-Pacific Strategic Papers.

Under the ADF’s First Principles Review, CDSS was also assigned responsibility for the Directorate of Learning Capability, which extended the Centre’s portfolio considerably. Put in ‘kiwi terms’, the change would be like taking a number of functions of the NZ Defence College and placing them under command of Commandant NZDF CSC, including: learning strategies and technologies; policy development and national vocational education and training accreditation.

A few years ago, the terms CDSS and DSSC were virtually synonymous. This is no longer the case, but for prospective students, access to the related directorates only serves to enhance the learning experience and the Centre’s wider remit is very much in the background. Acknowledging my bias, as an ex-SD at CDSS, if any NZDF CSC alumnus has the opportunity to attend DSSC, either residentially or perhaps ‘virtually’ in the future, I would encourage taking the opportunity. There are even direct flights to Canberra from Wellington these days - to assist with undertaking the former, at least!
“Padre, what are you doing here?” Words from a colleague at the start of ICSC(J) 81 and something I’d asked myself twenty times before the course start date. Why would a chaplain, someone who will never hold or exercise executive command attend the Intermediate Command and Staff Course? Perhaps this question would be best raised in a syndicate Socratic Warrior exercise (although I’m not sure that it would be as engaging as discussions about women in combat roles, legalising cannabis or the likely implications for New Zealand of Australia’s closeness to the U.S.). I asked myself that question often, because if I’m honest I wasn’t overly excited to be attending ICSC(J) 81. However, upon reflection the value to me as a Chaplain was immense.

Taking time away from the normal routine of Camp life to enhance critical thinking skills was of particular benefit. This skillset underpinned every aspect of the course, and was applied robustly by course members to the ‘Survey of New Zealand Foreign Policy’ lectures in particular.

Engagement with strategic thinking, international security, the impact of globalisation and military strategists all gave me a greater understanding of the wider world we live in and how we as the NZDF need to maintain maximum flexibility to respond to the challenges of an ever changing global landscape. Chaplains hold a very special role in that.

The most valuable module of the course to my role was Command and Leadership. Simply put these two concepts go to the very heart of chaplaincy because they are all about people and in the context of ICSC(J) 81 they also went to the heart of culture. I’ve always been aware as a green skin (even a speccy green skin) that the three services have different cultures, all underpinned by the same ethos and values. Hearing from commanders serving in all three services about command philosophy certainly helped create a framework for understanding some of those differences and the rationale behind them.

The greatest benefit of ICSC(J) 81 was not just the learning but the relationships built and friendships gained. The course was the largest yet, at 60 participants. The value of those networks (whether formed at PT or the bar) can’t be underestimated. Forging relationships over the two month period we were together will allow ICSC(J) 81 to impact the NZDF with new understandings of culture, technical capabilities of each other’s services, insight into how we think within our services and create friends across the three distinct cultures which forge the NZDF.
‘Padre, what are you doing here?’

Ka tangi te tītī
Ka tangi te kākā
Ka tangi hoki ahau

As the tītī (sooty sheerwater) voices its presence
As the kākā voices its presence
So too do I

What was I doing there at ICSC9J81? Contributing. Learning. Growing. Adding my voice to the diverse mix which will see the NZDF maintain maximum operational effectiveness as it grapples with the many issues facing the multi-faceted battlespace which is the world today.

Join the Command and Staff College on
The NZDF Engagement Hub

We are starting to build up a collection of stimulating articles which pertain to ACSC(J) but which will be of interest to everyone.

Join the group, peruse the articles, voice an opinion.

To register into The Engagement Hub e-mail: thehub@nzdf.mil.nz

Whāia te iti kahurangi ki te tūohu koe me he maunga teitei.

Seek the treasure you value most dearly; if you bow your head, let it be to a lofty mountain.

ICSC (J) 81 Reflections from Chaplain Zane Elliot