Hon. Jerry MacArthur Hultin
Under Secretary of the Navy
Keynote address to the
Current Strategy Forum
U.S. Naval War College,
Newport, R.I.
June 16, 1998

Introduction

Thank you for your kind introduction and your invitation to speak to the Current Strategy Forum. The Secretary of the Navy, John Dalton, would like to have been here today but he is in Portugal participating in World Expo '98, part of the Year of the Ocean Commemoration. The Navy received very positive press coverage last week when Secretary Dalton was joined by the President and Vice President at the National Oceans Conference held at the Naval Post Graduate School.

As the Under Secretary of the Navy, it is a particular pleasure and honor to be standing here today at the intellectual cradle of our naval service, especially as we face the start of the 21st century.

Only a hundred or so years ago, Alfred Thayer Mahan, William Sims, Teddy Roosevelt and other young turks frequented the halls of the Naval War College. While I won't admit to having personal conversations with Alfred Thayer Mahan or Teddy Roosevelt, I can feel the intellectual spirit and renaissance ignited by Mahan, Sims and Roosevelt, as they stood at a parallel point in our history.

They were defining America's role in a new century and showing how naval power could secure it. And they were doing so at a time when a number of revolutions -- such as armor and naval rifles, oil and electricity, radio and communications, aviation and submarines -- were coming on line. But what joined these revolutions was the intellectual content and construct that reaffirmed the American spirit and made this a truly revolutionary period.

Today, as I will suggest, we are witnessing a series of revolutions that may prove even more profound and, if we are clever enough, more productive in advancing the well being of the United States.

Our challenge today is to ensure that when Americans look back 100 years from now, they too see that our actions set in motion a revolution in naval affairs. A revolution that helped to build a century of relative peace.

How do we do that?

Here is where I challenge you to think deeply and to think differently. Whether you are from the uniformed services, government, academia or the private sector, we all have a role to play in shaping the new millennium. I will share my ideas on our changing military requirements, what the Navy and Marine Corps are doing to meet those requirements, and finally, what we in the Department of the Navy have yet to do.

Take a look at this map which depicts electronic activity in a twenty-four hour period. It is obvious that we live on the seacoasts of an ocean planet. Our lives - no matter where we may call home - are inextricably tied to the sea. The challenge before us is to look at the future with this basic geography in mind.

The question before us is deceptively simple. How can naval power best serve America in the years ahead? To answer that, we must first ask,
"What has changed in our world?" and,
"What do we as a nation intend to do about it?"

What has changed?

The new millennium is already here. It came ten years early with the tumultuous events of the three years, 1989, 1990, and 1991. We saw its arrival in the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War. We saw it again in the lightening victory of allied forces in Desert Storm. It was a change that upset all the "givens" of the past forty years and even the last 100. With the new epoch came a resurgence of democracy and free enterprise. But, it left us in a world of rapid and seemingly unpredictable technological, political, social, and economic change. It affected our every day life as much as it did the international scene.

We may know that a new epoch has begun, but we have yet to comprehend where the changes will lead us as a nation - or what they may portend for mankind. Our uncertainty is reflected in the fact that we don't have a good name for the epoch in which we now find ourselves. It is still the "post-Cold War" - as if to say that we know what we have left, but we are not quite sure where we are going.

Yet, we do know something about this new epoch.

We know it is still a world of crises and increasingly it is a world of threats to our interests and our lives. The past seven years have made that clear. With the passing of the major threat of global nuclear war with the former Soviet Union, we now we face a new kind of asymmetric threat, from terrorism, to cyber-war, to biological weapons. The world is still a very dangerous place We all know the United States must maintain a highly capable force and that the range of challenges runs far beyond that once defined by the Soviet threat. Recent events in India and Pakistan make this point and show how security challenges are far more complex and solutions less clear cut than in the past.

Yet, ours is also a world of promise and hope. As President Clinton has said, America's real greatness lies ahead. We are a nation on the move. Our economy is the envy of the world. Americans are at the forefront of change. We are optimistic about our future - just as we were at the start of the 20th century. Still, there are important differences from a century ago. America has become the global power, economically, politically and militarily. The globalization of commerce and the spread of mass telecommunications have transformed us into a global society. And, with that globalization, has come a surge in democracy and free enterprise around the world. Americans have real reason to be optimistic. The next century truly can be our golden age.

What do we as a nation intend to do?: The Imperative of Engagement

What does all this have to do with naval power and this forum?

The connection lies in the question, "What do we as a nation intend to do about the changes in the world?" How can we seize the initiative and ensure that America remains safe and prosperous?

How can we, in the words of President Clinton, "develop policies and then make agreements" so that the "definition of greatness... is different tomorrow than it was yesterday?" In the President's view, "We [as great nations – the United States, Russia, China, Europe] should want to be measured by our ideas and our achievements and our ability to raise our children and our ability to relate to each other."

These questions lie at the core of the President's new National Security Strategy in something he calls "the imperative of engagement." America has a choice to make. If we exert our leadership and take an active part in shaping this new world, then we can make America and the world safer and more prosperous. If we withdraw into ourselves and fail to lead, then the threats will multiply, the opportunities for peace and stability will diminish, and our own continued prosperity will be in jeopardy.

America simply cannot withdraw from its leading role without ultimately hurting itself. Our economy and our destiny as a nation are bound too tightly to the rest of the world to imagine that we can ignore events even half a world away. Look at the business pages of any newspaper to see what I mean. An economic crisis in Asia has a deep impact on everything from our stock market - and the pension plans of most Americans, to our ability to export corn from Kansas. A cut off of Middle Eastern oil may not affect shipments from Venezuela or Mexico, but it will drive world oil prices so high that our economy and our livelihoods certainly will suffer. But, that is not all. An inability to control ethnic strife in Bosnia or Kosovo can result in a spreading war that can engulf the Balkans and, sooner or later, cost American lives and threaten American interests. We are indeed in a global society, and we must stay engaged.

Am I saying that the United States must do everything? No. We cannot and should not try to play the world's policeman. But, we must recognize that, for the foreseeable future, America will be the essential player - and we will be the only nation able to play the leading role on a global scale. However, we must carefully choose where and when to take action. But, we must be able to take action when necessary.

Yet, if we limit our role to reacting -- even if we pick our crises well, we will fail. Catch-up ball is not enough. We must prevent things from getting out of hand -- not only today, but also for years to come.

Shape, Respond, Prepare

The President has laid out a three-fold approach to doing just this:
to shape the world around us by preventing or deterring the threats to stable peaceful change;

to respond to its crises - everything from an evacuation of Americans from a troubled land (as we were prepared to do from Indonesia just a few weeks ago), to fighting and winning a major war like Desert Storm; and finally,
to prepare to meet the challenges of tomorrow -- that is, to ensure that we can shape tomorrow's world and respond to its crises as well as we do to those of today.

These three tasks are the basic requirements for our national military strategy, and the fundamental tasks to which our naval power must contribute. But, what do those terms, "shape," "respond," and "prepare," really mean?

How do naval forces shape?
How can naval forces best respond to crisis and conflict?
How should we prepare for the uncertain future before us?

Responding to crises and conflict is fairly straightforward. We do it all the time. Mahan would certainly be quite at home at telling us how to fight, or how to translate control of the sea into victory in war. But, what about shaping and preparing? This is where I challenge you to think creatively.

How do we shape?

Answering this question demands an understanding of naval power that is different from that explored by Mahan. This new understanding is what our current Revolution in Naval Affairs is all about. But, it is about a lot more than Navy and Marine Corps.

What do I mean by that?

Shaping not only involves Sailors, Soldiers, Airmen and Marines. Shaping involves diplomats, economists, jurists, Peace Corps workers, and a host of others. It is the domain of the State Department, of Justice, Treasury, Commerce, Agriculture, and of non-governmental agencies. It is the work of American business and the media, as much as it is of the Department of Defense or Navy. This is definitely NOT the world as Mahan knew it. And, it will involve a change in how we, in Navy and Marine Corps, think. I can remember volunteering for the village pacification program in Viet Nam, and being told that it was not front line duty. We know better now. It was only in those villages that the war could have been won. They were the front lines.

The unifying thread that ties the entire effort together, private as well as public, is peaceful change. Peaceful change is not "stability." Stability is a means to an end, not an end in itself. That doesn't lessen its importance. Stability is the framework within which democracy, respect for individual rights, and free enterprise can grow. It is easy for Americans to forget just how revolutionary those ideas are, and just how de-stabilizing they can be. After all, these are the ideas that overthrew and discredited Communism. Yet, these ideas are also the seeds of a safer more prosperous world.

Balancing stability and change will not be easy. Paul Kennedy writes that "wealth and power, or economic strength and military strength are always relative" and "the international balances can never be still." This idea of dynamic peaceful change is what is behind "engagement."

Our task, therefore, is not absolute stability, at all costs, but providing sufficient economic and political stability to enable change to take place - peacefully. Our task is to encourage change in many of the world's economic and political fundamentals, and to create change without bloodshed, and without escalating into war.

Presence: Shaping and Responding

This is where that "new understanding of naval power" begins to enter the picture. The military role in shaping goes well beyond port visits and people to people contacts, and well beyond guarding the sea-lanes. However good these efforts may be, they understate the potential of military power. The real military contribution is a broad-based conventional deterrence. It is providing the security framework for peaceful change.

Naval forces provide this framework by being there and shaping the local security calculus. Our forces cannot be wished away, they cannot be intimidated and they cannot be ignored. The recent confrontation with Iraq is a good example. Saddam Hussein, however hard he tried, could not ignore those battle groups off his coast. We forced ourselves into his calculations and shaped the result. We deterred. Where would we be if we had failed to use Naval forces?

Our visible presence on scene and the promise it represents that the full might of America can be brought to bear, become part of the strategic assessments of friend and foe alike. This may not be a guarantee that a future Saddam will not commit some folly. But, it is our best chance of demonstrating that fomenting a crisis or attacking our friends and interests will not succeed. That is conventional deterrence! And, that is the necessary framework for peaceful change!

Preventing crises and local conflicts clearly involves a kind of deterrence that is very different from what we knew in the Cold War. It is not directed at a single threat, like the old Soviet Union. It is deterrence that must operate against a wide range of potential opponents, across the spectrum from peacekeeping to nuclear war. It is deterrence built on conventional weapons and capabilities, and the willingness to use them as necessary. But, it also remains deeply concerned with weapons of mass destruction, especially the spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons.

These distinctions are significant for our future. The challenges we must face are complex. The chances of a global war may have diminished, but the likelihood of a threat to individual American lives is as great or greater than it has ever been. We face adversaries who may perceive they have little to lose, and who will capitalize on what they see to be American weaknesses. They will seek to confront us with actions to which we appear to have no obvious response, or for which a large-scale escalation would be inappropriate and self-defeating. Or, they may try to present us with a fait accompli that we cannot immediately prevent.

Deterring these kinds of challenges is less a question of massive power than it is of meeting the threat with appropriate force that is tailored to the situation.

General Chuck Krulak, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, likes to talk about the chaos on the littoral and the enduring need for the man on the ground. He speaks of a Marine Corps that must be

able to undertake a "three block" mission. The same unit must be able to render humanitarian assistance on one city block, while conducting peacekeeping on the next block, and fighting and winning a war on the block after that.

Just so. The key to this broad based conventional deterrence is this kind of ability to respond to just about any eventuality up to and including regional war. It is a requirement for balanced forces, land, sea, and air. It is a requirement for agility, mobility, and flexibility -- just the capabilities that have always been the hallmark of expeditionary naval forces. Those capabilities will make naval forces the centerpiece of conventional deterrence.

But, deterring would-be troublemakers is only part of the security calculus. There is also the need to reassure friends and allies. An aggressor must know that our friends and allies will turn to the United States for help, and that they will get it. This element of deterrence cannot be sustained with promises alone. The critical factor is the realization by both friends and foes that we can be there when needed, and that we can provide meaningful aid.

Being there when needed and providing meaningful aid. Both have become more difficult in our new Post Cold War world, yet, both are at the root of our efforts to build coalitions and partnerships:

"To be there when needed" means more than, "We are ready to come whenever we are invited." If we cannot protect our friends from threats until we are there, but cannot get there until we are invited, we are likely to get the invitation only when it is too late. What we really need to be able to say is, "We are ready to protect you while you reach the decision to invite us. We will not let aggressors intimidate you into refusing access." Sea based power can provide just such a shield from international waters. This is why sea based theater missile defense built around Navy upper and lower tier is so important.

Similarly, "to provide meaningful aid" means more than, "We arrive and do it all." Friends and foes - and the American public - must know that we can and will act together. That is what a partnership is. That is how coalitions function. However, to do that, we must exercise regularly with the land, sea and air forces of our potential partners where they -- and we -- will need to operate in times of crisis. That, too, is something that the balanced forward Navy-Marine Team can provide.

How would a potential aggressor see all this? How would it enter his security calculus?

He would calculate that, no matter what ploy he might use, he would be faced with an appropriate U.S. response. He would be unable to intimidate his neighbors and unable to prevent the arrival of land based U.S. forces. He would see U.S. capabilities multiplying the power of our local allies, and sustaining a coalition ranged against him. He would see U.S. commitments and promises are not just words, but - as Chuck Krulak likes to phrase it - "gray hulls and green Marines." He would see that aggression would not work. That's deterrence, and that's a framework for stability.

Still, if this were all that we did, then we would be guilty of trying to create stability for the sake of stability. But, when this kind of stabilizing is combined with all those other efforts - diplomatic,

business, aid, and so on - we begin to create the kind of engagement that can indeed shape an uncertain world.

How does the Navy plan to do all that?

Revolution in Military Affairs

This is just the question that the Navy and Marine Corps have been exploring for the last six years. I told a Capitol Hill audience a few weeks ago that the Navy-Marine Corps success in redefining themselves and thinking innovatively about the future was one of Washington's best kept secrets. I want to tell you what has been happening.

In 1991, just as the Cold War was dying, the Navy and Marine Corps recognized these world changes. They saw great opportunities for naval power, and wrote a pivotal white paper, "...From the Sea." Bob White of the Minneapolis Star Tribune put it well when he wrote, "To say that the Navy turned around that cumbersome battleship of doctrine-and the allocation of resources that makes doctrine a reality --- is an understatement. This was a maritime pirouette." Let me read some of his words to you:

"Eight months after the Gulf War, the Navy and Marine Corps began work on a new strategy. Eleven months later a short but revolutionary white paper appears setting 'a new direction for the naval service.' Institutional changes often require years rather than months, especially a change of this magnitude. The new direction reversed the priorities of many years putting political-diplomatic purposes first: peacetime stability, deterrence and crisis control."[1]

The Navy and Marine Corps did not stop there. They followed that white paper in 1994 with "Forward ...From the Sea," and then with new Navy and Marine Corps operating concepts over the last two years.

What was "revolutionary" about ...From the Sea?

Our CNO, Jay Johnson, recently wrote that the whole effort could be reduced to a single phrase that the purpose of naval power was "to influence events ashore, directly and decisively, from the sea, anytime, anywhere."

> "To influence events ashore" - says that control of the seas is not an end in itself but a means to an end. It is what shaping and responding are all about.
>
> "Directly and decisively" - is more than Mahan would have imagined possible and more than any other naval force has ever dared promise.
>
> "From the sea" - is what naval power is all about. It is the unique capability we bring to our joint forces. And, it is the idea behind that sea based conventional deterrence.

---

[1] Robert J. White, "Against odds, the navy adapts to change," Minneapolis Star Tribune, 28 Dec 1997 (Early Bird, 30 Dec 1997, pp. 9-10)

> "Anytime, anywhere" - is why our naval power cannot be ignored. We choose where to commit it and when.

That simple straightforward phrase, "to influence events ashore, directly and decisively, from the sea, anytime, anywhere," says what our Navy-Marine Team does, and what it aspires to be in the years to come.

The CNO went beyond this and described just where this would come together in meeting the kinds of 21st century requirements I have outlined.

He pointed to the need for "sea and area control" - the need to create a comprehensive defense not only of our own forces but also of our allies. A defense that can ensure those allies can make the tough decisions to open their facilities to our joint forces - and that land-based forces get where they are needed.

He pointed to a "littoral" that was defined by the range of sea based weapons - aircraft and missiles able to strike 1,000 miles or more from the coast, and Marines inserted hundreds of miles inland. Look what that will mean as we move into the next century: ERGMs - extended range guns - able to fire 200 miles inland, MV-22s able to insert Marines 500 miles or more inland, and tactical Tomahawks able to strike targets more than 1,000 nautical miles from the coast. As you can see, that "littoral" doesn't leave out much.

Finally, he combined these ideas and the concepts of presence and deterrence. He said that, if our forward forces could defend themselves and our allies against attack, and if they could project enough power ashore to halt aggression, then presence and conventional deterrence would indeed be one.

Chuck Krulak, Jay Johnson and people throughout the Navy and Marine Corps have begun a Revolution in Naval Affairs, a sharp change with what naval forces can do.

The Navy and Marine Corps are not new to such Revolutions. By my count, we have already undertaken three.

> The first - the battleship revolution - began under Mahan here in Newport a century ago. It gave us our modern Navy and changed how the whole world looked at naval power.
>
> The second -- the development of carrier warfare and amphibious warfare -- took place in the 1920s (another time of low threats and lower budgets) again here in Newport but also at Quantico. That revolution laid the basis for our victories in the Pacific in World War II.
>
> The third -- putting ballistic missiles to sea on nuclear submarines -- was carried out by Admiral Rickover. It lent stability to the Cold War balance of terror, and helped us win the Cold War.

Each of these efforts took time. And our newest revolution will take time, as well. But, look at the ferment that is already taking place.

The Commandant set up a Warfighting Lab to explore new ways of multiplying the combat power of every Marine. They are tackling thorny problems all the way from urban warfare on that chaotic littoral, to dealing with biological and chemical weapons.

Jay Johnson is setting up a new Navy Warfare Concept Development Center (a recommendation I had a role in as a member of his CNO Executive Panel). Here at the Naval War College, we will explore new concepts and new ways of meeting the requirements I talked about just moment ago.

And, the concepts are there. Each year the Strategic Studies Group, headed by Admiral Jim Hogg, brings a new crop to market. Admiral Art Cebrowski's idea of network centric warfare - especially combined with Admiral Clemins IT-21 initiative -- jumps well into the information age and provides the means to do what we need to do with the forces we will have. Similarly, Admiral Paul Reason's recent "Sailing New Seas" puts some radical organizational proposals on the table.

It's an exciting time to be in the Fleet. Change is in the air. A Revolution is in progress. Young officers here today have the chance to transform the Navy and Marine Corps as never before. As the flag officers of tomorrow, you will play the crucial roles in leading the Navy Marine Team of the next century.

And young civilians here today, as the nation's top civilian leaders of tomorrow, you will help define and deploy this transformed naval power.

Preparing

This brings me to my last point, "preparing." This Revolution in Naval Affairs is a bright hope for the future. But, we have to build the forces and capabilities to go with it. That is not a new problem. Each of those three revolutions I cited also required a reallocation of resources. Each required a change in the way we in the Navy and Marine Corps, and particularly, the Department of the Navy, did business. Each required a parallel Revolution in Business Affairs to make it work.

Secretary Dalton and I are of one mind on this. We are intent on finding the resources to make this vision a reality. To do so, we have launched a Revolution in Business Affairs. We are striving with Secretary of Defense Cohen to, in his words, "achieve fundamental reform in how the Defense Department conducts its business."

Our Revolution in Business Affairs is concrete, far-reaching, radical change. It is the business equivalent of the military changes that the Navy and Marine Corps have undertaken.

We have been closely following developments in industry. During the 1990s, business undertook a "revolution." This revolution yielded today's prosperity and - with a strong dose of Presidential and Congressional leadership - produced our current balanced federal budget. Business leaders faced the stark realities of our global economy. They went through a painful assessment. They knew if

they did not make radical changes, they would lose to overseas competition. They had no choice. They broke with the past. They created a revolution that is the envy of the world.

Secretary Dalton and I have been studying that revolution - as have the Navy Studies Board and the CNO's Executive Panel. There has been much to learn and much that we can apply to the business of the Navy. For example,

> Chrysler reduced the time to design and roll out a new car from over three years to less than 12 months. Yet, we in the Department of Defense take 10 years or more to design and manufacture a new aircraft and 15 years for a new ship. If our predecessors had been content with that before World War II, we would not have had the planes that won the 1942 battle of Midway until around 1950 - or later. That's just not acceptable.
>
> Freddie Mac created an automated underwriting system that was so good it chopped mortgage approval times from three weeks to five minutes and cut the closing cost by half. Yet, we in Navy and Defense struggle along with an antiquated computer system in procurement that increases costs and delays decisions. Our financial statements are fed by more than 180 different computer systems. That, too, has got to go!

We have begun to identify our own "stark realities," and we are concentrating our actions into a visionary, strategic and coordinated effort. We will change how we operate and take an active role in the process of setting the budget and matching the resources to our budget goals.

We will work with the CNO and Commandant to make these changes. The Revolution in Business Affairs I am proposing will unfold over the next three years. We will lay out a Department of the Navy plan and we will adapt our efforts to take full advantage of the new opportunities, which present themselves.

Last week, I brought together nearly 60 of the Navy and Marine Corps' top admirals, generals, and civilians to pick our top business revolution initiatives. We met at the Acquisition Center of Excellence at the Washington Navy Yard, our revolutionary, fully computerized group decision center, and for five hours, these "eagles" entered and debated their best ideas for business revolution. Their insights and ideas are dramatic.

This is the stark, "out of the box" thinking that makes me so certain we will succeed in revolutionizing both how we fight and how we do business.

Let me put the same challenges to you that I did at last week's assembly of "eagles":

If you had to pick the top five business revolution initiatives for the Department of the Navy, what would you choose?

How do we overcome America's apparent preference for job preservation instead of defense strategy?

What will it really take to succeed at dramatic business change?

Why not have a revolution in people affairs – for major breakthroughs in pay, housing, pensions, 401(k) plans, training, health care, the Reserves?

Why not an operational revolution?

Are you willing to join us in making business, people and operational change successful?

Are you ready to make this 21st Century a golden era for America?

Conclusion

In his book, On the Origins of War and the Preservation of Peace Donald Kagan noted that : "A persistent and repeated error through the ages has been the failure to understand that the preservation of peace requires active effort, planning, the expenditure of resources, and sacrifices, just as war does." This warning cuts to the heart of what it means to be a democracy in a rapidly changing and none too stable world. It is the challenge we face in defining our role in the 21st century.

How do we create and sustain peaceful change?
How do we deter malevolent action?
What is the best role of military power in supporting change and deterring malevolence?
How can other governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations work effectively with the military and us with them?
How will the unique capabilities of our Navy-Marine Team best contribute to this effort?

If we can answer these questions over the next few days and in the years to come, then the next century will indeed be a golden age of American naval power.
We can do what our forebears did – but using our unique revolutions in military, business, people and operational affairs.

As Theodore Roosevelt said, "Far and away the best prize that life offers is the chance to work hard at work worth doing." That chance, life's best prize, is ours to claim! Join with me here this week and into the future, help America shape, respond, and prepare for the 21st Century!