

**Remarks as delivered ADM Mike Mullen  
Current Strategy Forum, Newport, RI  
June 13, 2007**

The single reason that I'm here is because of the people that I've been fortunate enough to serve with, literally from the day I walked into the Naval Academy in 1964 until now. And it is a real privilege to continue to serve with people like General Conway and Admiral Thad Allen, General George Casey, General Pete Pace, Admiral Ed Giambastiani, and General Buzz Moseley, and many others. It is a perk.

And we can't, just like I said in our discussions earlier about from the United States Navy's standpoint, we can't do it alone. I don't believe we can do it alone as a country. And certainly, in the world that has changed dramatically for us in the joint world, we can't -- there's no service that can do it alone, and so being associated with individuals like that routinely, it's one of the reasons it's easy to get up out of bed every day and come to work because it's a great group.

I don't want to talk too much about the process -- I talked about that in the last hour -- except to just really enforce what I said in terms of the comfort that I have with the process. If it were challenging, and to some degree, if it weren't different than what we've done in the past, I worried about it, and I wanted the process to be both vetted and even criticized to make sure we had it right. There was a question earlier about, is this DOA? And it isn't. I feel very comfortable answering that. At the same time, part of this development is, particularly given the challenges that we're dealing with in the world, is the multitude of ideas and how do we pick the right ones?

And I'll come back to that. I want to, at the end of my comments, which hopefully will just take 10 or 15 minutes, I want to talk about the term John Morgan talked in, which is the mental map, and I want to try to wrap it up there. And I really believe if we don't get -- if we don't do the kind of work we've been doing over the last year, that to the degree we get it right for the future, the right mental map for the future, it is tied to that work and those ideas and the -- (inaudible) -- of it, and the questions that come up, have you thought about this? And an expansion effort to create a strategy for us as serve on the maritime side that underpins, ideally, the strategy for us as a country, now and the future, which is a big task. So I'm very comfortable with the process.

So that's one point, and actually, I was asked on break out here, what about the marketing aspect of it? We don't raise marketers. We don't market very well. And we need to do a better job of that. So we have -- and I don't know how to be a marketer. That hasn't been a path for success in the Navy, so we have -- and if you don't get promoted, you don't get to be in charge, and so we have no marketers, almost. We have, as many people in Washington are these days, taken on a task of trying to understand strategic communication better.

Now, I am no communicator, and I believe we've got to do that probably more now than we ever have. So strategically communicating, and all that that means -- it's almost like

there must be a lot of money there in Washington because everybody's talking about it, and people go where the money flows. I don't think that's the case, but a lot of people are talking about strategic communication, and I think we have to do it better.

And so part of this effort, we're back to process here, as we roll out this strategy later this year is how do we market it. What is the PR campaign? How do we sustain it? How do I connect with the farmer in Peoria, throughout America to make sure they know and understand, short of a crisis, short of seeing us in the worldwide news on a regular basis, that they understand the important of having a navy and strong maritime services and the need to support it as these times continue to change?

Thad Allen said it's like breathing air until you don't have any more. You're sort of assuming. When you close off the oxygen bottle, you start to recognize that you could be in trouble, that our commerce -- which 90-plus percent of what we move in and out of this country -- and that's true broadly throughout the world, we take it for granted.

We take these secure sea lanes for granted, and it's our responsibility to make sure that they are secure, not just here but in lots of places. Lots of people do that. When you have, and this is the globalization piece, but when you have a dramatic event -- in the middle of that right now -- it isn't local; it isn't even regional. It is global, and it affects economies around the world. And -- not unlike connecting with the farmer in Peoria -- there 115 billion dollars that I've got on the Hill for the '08 budget.

I also believe that as a parent -- and that we ought to have a connection there -- that America gets the Navy it wants from the people of America. I also believe, not just in our country, but that parents around the world want to raise their kids to a better standard of living in a secure environment where it can be better for them than it was as they grew up. So how do you make that connection?

And a lot of it's got to do with good economies in which people are employed and can thrive and improve. And good economies take having a secure environment in which to grow. So that's one point about process, and as we roll this out later on this year -- and we haven't decided. It's going to be a book, it's going to be a slideshow, it's going to be -- we don't know yet. Except we know it's coming out, and we're in that -- that's how we go to work there.

Secondly, I think it's really important to be able to answer the question why we have Navy, and there are three principle reasons, one of which is, and I talked about it a little bit in the previous discussion, there is a requirement that we have a navy to win our nation's wars, the wars that our leaders choose to involve us in. So being able to project power, and it's what expeditionary forces do, is clearly a principle reason that we have it.

Secondly, and I alluded to this earlier, is the requirement to sustain the -- (inaudible) -- basically protect commerce to ensure that we can do that and do it in a way that economies flow and grow. And then thirdly, to protect the homeland. And there's a lot of emphasis, and you may or may not recall that, you know, 9/11, there actually were

quite a few Navy ships that were involved in that. That, again, is an expectation. It isn't me standing up cheering, saying, look what we're doing. When Bob Natter, who was our Atlantic Fleet commander at the time, started moving ships immediately, that was exactly what should have happened. Nobody had to call Bob Natter up and say, start moving ships. We understand that.

We also have a very deep, long-standing relationship with the Coast Guard. All of us grew up doing that, one way or another. Thad Allen was just answering a question to the press about the challenges, the Coast Guard. I mean, the Coast Guard is operating with us in the northern Gulf right now, protecting those two oil platforms, which provides about 95 percent of the GDP at this point for Iraq. And again, it's the oxygen discussion.

Nobody will pay much attention until one of those two oil platforms goes away, and then you look at the significant impact it has there. So the Coast Guard has got overseas responsibilities in addition to significantly increased responsibilities for homeland security. And so we work with him constantly and easily because of our previous relationship.

The other thing that the Coast Guard brings is -- the Coast Guard brings, actually, a couple things. They bring a lot; I don't want to limit it to two. But they bring a lot in the current discussion. They bring a view of the interagency that I can't see because that's where they live. That's what they do every day when they come to work. So my ability to see into the inner agency and away from a maritime service that Thad Allen brings is just huge.

And then, finally, the Coast Guard has relationships around the world. Thad Allen's been in and out of China a lot because he has licensing requirements that are federally regulated and he's responsible for, so he has relationships with people all over the world that I don't have. I mean he goes there and sees them and engages them. So that's another -- that, again, to me just leverages some of what -- we had an opportunity to leverage some of what we both do and then tie that back into the home game, that in the end, we've got to protect this country. That's what we have a military for, and I understand that.

I believe we can do that with a strong Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard. In particular, that we have a tendency to do as a country, bringing the troops home, whenever that occurs, we have a tendency to isolate, and if we don't push our maritime services out in the expeditionary fashion that we normally are involved in, that is a very dangerous move for our country in the time that we're living, in the circumstances that we're in right now.

So that's really the second -- why do we have one? And I would hang it on those three things, and clearly we have work to do to ensure that we get that right for the future. Those of you that have listened to me before, the biggest challenge I have as a service chief, in my priorities, one of which is keep the fleet going today, keep the operational level up and sustain our readiness. And if you're out there and doing it, and a bunch of

individuals here are wearing the uniform, you would know how good we are at doing that right now -- I'm very proud of that -- across the full spectrum of missions.

Secondly, to make sure, none of this works without great people and that we take care of them, and I really mean it from A to Z, and their families, and that's going pretty well, not that it doesn't have its challenges, but thirdly, to build a fleet for the future, and I've still got that -- question was asked to Thad Allen about the challenges he had in his modernization program with the 110s.

Clearly I have my challenges in the shipbuilding program. We had a destabilized shipbuilding program for a long time. It is not going to settle out because Mike Mullen comes in and says, 313, and a month later, everything's set

It's going to take us awhile to get through that, to get it, to get it right for the future, but I have also come to believe -- and I said it when we did this before, 313 is the minimum number of submarines, the minimum number of aircraft carriers, the minimum number of cruisers, destroyers, support ships in the world that we're living in. I am pushing myself on that at this point from the standpoint of I'm not sure if that's right anymore. And we're looking at, how do we have it right for the future?

That said, we commissioned another ship the other day, and I'm at 277, and I'm on my way up. Okay? When I became CNO, I was on my way down. We stopped it, and we're going in the right direction, and we could need to start there to get to 313. So the why we have a Navy is important, and getting that message out.

And then lastly, I want to talk a little bit about some of the things that we've learned with respect to the development of this strategy and the kind of -- I call them some of the imperatives that jump off the page as we've done this and then reinforced, one of which is to promote cooperative relationships, to make sure that we are -- that we recognize this is out there and growing and that we need to do that.

And I talked about that in terms of not just winning our wars because that's another imperative, but preventing them. We are, because of who we are and where we were, we are out there all the time, and that prevention piece and that influence piece and the forward presence piece is a big -- is a key part of winning our nation's wars. I mentioned that earlier: you win one also by not having one. So that's a piece.

Another one which will be a part of this strategy that is a little bit alarming to me, or to many of us, and I include myself in that, is the whole issue of deterrence and escalation and de-escalation. And I had several people do some work on this for me over the last six or seven months, and what surprised me greatly was the fact that there's been precious little work done on deterrence since 1989 and that deterrence now is much tougher in a world, just do some work. I mean, do some work on the whole proliferation -- (inaudible) -- issue. Do some work on where they are, who's trying to get nukes, who's trying to get chemical, biological weapons, and this, some of us may have put this in the too-hard category before. We can't afford to do that now. We have got to address this.

And so we are in a one or a zero, and I don't believe in that, that we just get into a pickle and you've got two choices. It's either kinetic or it's not, and that's not an acceptable answer. How do we, how do we use the concept, how do we use the principles, sorry, tied to escalation, de-escalation and deterrence in the world that we're living in now, where we have state actors who are bad guys and we have non-state actors who are bad guys, all of whom are seeking this kind of technology and capability? And I was very much taken back at how little intellectual energy and effort, how little study has been done, and I think we've got to work on that because I think there's great potential there.

It's hard work. And what I found was, many of the individuals who did this for a living, as I grew up, when we were at it with the Soviet Union, they are not doing it anymore and they have -- we have not found their reliefs. And I'm always a big believer in finding my relief. Or, you know, training your relief. We do that. So that's a piece that was a little alarming to me as we looked at this, and I think it's an imperative that's out there for us in the strategy as well. So those are some of the things, and believe me, again, this isn't about rolling a strategy out, but it's some of the things that we've learned.

The last -- I'd just like to close my comments and open up to questions -- the last thing I want to talk about is this idea of the mental map. I was given a book about it six months ago to read called *A Peace to End All Peace*, which that individual who gave it to me said, this is the definitive book on why we are here today, and this was a book about the breakup of the Ottoman Empire from 1913 to 1922.

And as I read this book, and actually, at this point, I had not even heard the term mental map, which John Morgan brought to me a couple of months ago, but as I read this book, and for me it was a very difficult book to keep track of who was who and who was doing what to whom, and there is a message there as well because I didn't grow up in that part of the world, so it's harder for me to track than what George Washington was doing or what Jefferson was doing or what Adams was doing because I know something about that.

So generally, it's harder for me to track, and then specifically, it was difficult, I mean, it was very challenging throughout to understand how badly leadership missed major decision after major decision, and it was a pretty bright group of people. And their mental map of what the future was going to look like was something that -- because obviously I know what's happened since; I can look back on it and say, what were they thinking? And these were not people that were incapable of making decisions or people to whom we don't give an incredible amount of credit in many, many ways.

So that piece, that piece really got to me, and so one of the questions that comes out of that is, how much do we know about wherever we're operating? And let's talk about the Middle East. How much do we know, as we develop a strategy, as we look at what we're going to do for the future? One of the compelling issues, for me, is we've got to start to see this through other people's eyes, that we cannot look at it through our own. If we do that, I can almost guarantee -- actually, you might want to approach it this way: if we do it, it would be exactly what not to do.

One way to get to your strategy. I'm not saying we ought to do that, but I believe if we did only that, we'd get it dead wrong. Go ahead and show this one slide.

See? Two messages here, and this is, how do you see it through other people's eyes? This is a slide that I was shown about a year ago when I was visiting Australia. And I was in at a brief by the J-3, and he was giving me a Power Point presentation, and boom, this slide goes up. Didn't have the clouds on it; I'll talk to those in a second. Didn't have the clouds on it at the time; this slide shows up, and I go, gee, that's a funny slide. It doesn't have the United States in the middle.

This is the J-3 for the Australian joint staff. And, of course, guess who he's got in the middle?

It's Australia. And there were a couple things that I took away from this. One is, and see this little dot up here in the right hand corner? Right up there? That's the United States.

Actually, it's the United States and Canada.

And secondly, when you talk to them about certain things that were challenging them from Indonesia through Papua New Guinea through East Timor up in the PI, Vietnam, China, Korea and Japan, there's a lot of common interest there that they're working -- except they're working it from their view. And to the degree -- I believe to the degree we rolled -- (inaudible) -- to our view, it is a great strength. If we don't have a view that includes that, we're whistling by the graveyard. So that slide, and I've talked of this a lot, certainly, to many, many people in the Navy because we've got to see it through other people's eyes. That's what wasn't going on from 1913 to 1922, by the way, very much at the time.

And then the other piece here, and actually, when the slide came up this morning from Washington, I said, I don't want it with the clouds on it, so the staff took the clouds off it. Then after the inter-agency question, I said, put the ones with the clouds on .because that's the interagency. If you don't, other than saying, other than saying, I'm -- broadly, those are interagents. You should know each one of them. They've got a lot of good people trying to do good things.

I've got to be able to develop my strategy for the Navy and maritime services and wonder what it looks like through their eyes: Justice, Congress, State, Energy, Transportation, Homeland Security, as well as Defense. You want to know why I didn't put four O-6s in a room and say, here's the pizza, come back when you get it right? Not possible. Not possible. Okay. Thanks. You can close the curtains or turn the slide off. Anyway, those are some thoughts. Questions you might have?