

1997

**Medal of Honor Society
Arlington, Virginia
19 January 1997**

What a remarkable week this has been!

It began with an inspiring Medal of Honor ceremony at the White House adding the names of seven extraordinary heroes to your rolls. Then on Friday the President honored Bob Dole, a great American hero by any measure, with the Medal of Freedom—and then unveiled the plans for a World War II memorial to honor all who participated in that mighty struggle that defeated tyranny, preserved freedom, and as the president so aptly stated, saw America come of age.

This is a city of monuments to America's struggle to build and to preserve this nation. In granite and in stone we celebrate our victories and remember our heroes. We build these monuments, for we know well that a nation that forgets its heroes cannot itself long remain remembered.

So it is only right for me and for my fellow Joint Chiefs, at the beginning of a week when America honors its democratic roots and inaugurates its president, to be with you and honor you. For you are our finest monuments to highest heroism and noblest sacrifice.

This morning in a special memorial service at our National Cemetery you paid tribute to your comrades who fell in battle or passed away over the years. But on this occasion the Chiefs and I wish to honor you who are here with us.

Surely yours is the most select fraternity on earth. There are no associate members, no honorary or guest memberships. Membership is not measured by influence or rank or civic accomplishment. Membership in your Society comes only to those who "were touched with fire," who went above and beyond the call of duty and who offered up their lives for comrades and country — without reservation or regret.

That is why in the hearts of every American your Society is the most honored congregation in the world.

Your numbers are few, for few survive the consequences of such gallantry. Of the three thousand four hundred and twenty Americans who went above and beyond the call of duty and were awarded the Medal of Honor, only 150 of you are still with us. Still with us to share your legacy of valor, still with us to remind the nation of its roots, still with us to inspire new generations with the "contagion of your courage."

Winston Churchill once said that of all the human qualities, courage comes first because it is the quality, which guarantees all others. The courage that you have handed down to our men and women in uniform has, for more than 200 years, guaranteed our freedom, our security, and our prosperity.

Since the last time you gathered here in Washington, sixteen members of your Society have been laid to rest. But last week in that moving ceremony at the White House, President Clinton honored seven African-American heroes of World War II and added their names to your most select roster.

Six Medals of Honor were awarded posthumously: to Staff Sergeant Edward A. Carter, Jr.; Staff Sergeant Ruben Rivers; Staff Sergeant Leonard E. Dowden; First Lieutenant John R. Fox; Private First Class Willy F. James, Jr.; and First Lieutenant Robert J. Peagler. One living WWII veteran, First Lieutenant Vernon J. Baker, was present to receive the Medal that the President said was "as richly deserved as it was long overdue."

While I cannot do justice to the deeds of all of these men, Lieutenant Baker's story captures the essence of their heroism. While his deeds are more than fifty years old, his valor is now a part of our future — new threads, woven in red, white and blue into the tapestry that is the living spirit of America.

From now on the tale of his heroism will be there for all to see, a monument to human courage and an inspiration to thousands of Americans, citizens and soldiers alike.

On the 5th of April in 1945, Lieutenant Vernon Baker was an infantry platoon leader, fighting with the 92d Infantry Division in Italy. On that day in a critical advance over mountainous terrain, he personally attacked and destroyed three machine gun positions and one observation post, killing nine enemy soldiers at close quarters.

Lieutenant Baker then, without regard for his own safety, purposely drew the enemy fire on himself so his battered unit, in which two out of every three had been hit, could evacuate its wounded. True to his own motto of "keep moving," the next night Lieutenant Baker led an attack through an enemy minefield that was covered by heavy enemy fire.

Vernon Baker's exploits, added to yours, are now a special part of an American history of extraordinary gallantry. Your courage, your spirit and your dedication to comrades and country are the inspiration for today's men and women

in uniform — in Korea, in the Med, in the skies over Iraq, in every service, and in every operation. from Sarajevo, to the Straits of Hormuz, and to Somalia.

And it was in Somalia that two American warriors, Master Sergeant Gary Gordon and Sergeant First Class Randall Shughart, joined your ranks.

These men earned the Medal of Honor while serving with Task Force Ranger in Mogadishu on the third of October 1993. From an orbiting helicopter they saw their sister ship go down, saw movement amid the wreckage, and saw the streets quickly fill with Somali gunmen advancing toward the crash site and their injured comrade.

At their own insistence they “fast roped” down in the midst of scores of hostile militiamen. For long minutes they fought savagely to protect the one pilot who had survived the crash. In the end, their ammunition exhausted, wounded, and fighting only with their pistols, they were cut down by the intense enemy fire. Though Gordon and Shughart did not survive, Chief Warrant Officer Michael Durant, their injured friend, did.

The President of the United States awarded Medals of Honor to both of these heroes posthumously. On that memorable day, General Gordon Sullivan, then the Army Chief of Staff, read the words of another soldier — William Tecumseh Sherman — about the bonds of trust between comrades under fire. In a letter to Ulysses Grant, General Sherman wrote, “Throughout the war you were always in my mind. I always knew if I were in trouble, and you were still alive, you would come to my assistance.”

Those words are the soldier’s creed, and they in turn brought these words from Sergeant Gordon’s wife, Carmen, in a very special and tender letter to her children.

“One night,” she wrote, “before you were born, your father and I had a funny little talk about dying. I teased that I would not know where to bury him. Very quietly he said, ‘Up home in Maine, in my uniform.’”

She goes on to say, “Your dad never liked to wear a uniform [home on leave], and Maine was so far away from us. Only after he was laid to rest, in a tiny flag-filled graveyard in Lincoln, Maine, did I understand.”

“His parents, burying their only son, could come tomorrow and the day after that. You and I would not have to pass his grave on our way to the grocery store, to Little League games or ballet recitals. Our lives would go on.”

“And to the men he loved and died for, the uniform was a silent salute, a final repeat of his vows.”

“Once again,” she concluded. “he had taken care of all of us.”

Like Baker, like Gordon, like Shughart, you here have taken care of all of us. And we shall never forget.

But my tribute today would not be complete without recognition of your immediate families who also gave so much to our nation. Theirs has not been a light or easy burden. They also risked everything, their fathers, their brothers, or their husbands. And today the Joint Chiefs and I honor them as well, and pledge to you — the members of the Society — that we will hold fast to our memories of what you did for us so that our future too can have its heroes.

With that, God Bless you, thank you for what you did and what you are, and God Bless America.

**West Point Society
Washington, DC Chapter
22 January 1997**

It is a real pleasure to be here today, especially in light of this season’s memorable Army-Navy classic. I suspect that had Army not staged another heroic 4th Quarter stand you would still be grumpy, and my task today would be that much harder. I think we can all be terribly proud of what those young men accomplished this year, not only in Philadelphia but also against Auburn in the Independence Bowl. At my age, I should probably give up watching Army football; I’m not sure my heart can stand it!

In a more serious vein, we can all be very proud of the continuing vitality and importance of the U.S. Military Academy and its sister academies. There’s a saying that, “At West Point much of the history we teach was made by the people we taught.” And there’s a lot of truth in that.

From building railroads to guarding the frontier to fighting our biggest wars, West Point graduates have made an immeasurable contribution to the growth and security of this great Nation. Along the way, West Point produced Presidents, astronauts, business leaders, ambassadors and thousands of graduates whose leadership in and out of uniform have meant so much to this country and its people.

So I was thrilled to receive an invitation from my old boss, Butch Saint, to meet with you today to offer my perspective on the challenges and opportunities facing our Armed Forces as we approach a new century.

These next few months will be busy ones. We will have a new Secretary with big shoes to fill. We will soon go to

the Hill to fight the annual budget campaign. And this spring we'll hold the QDR, which by May promises to light the path to the force of the future.

Amid all this, lots of things will continue to keep us awake at night: elections in Bosnia; the health of Boris Yeltsin and Russian democracy; the threat of international terrorism; China and Hong Kong; and tension in Korea. Abroad, the only constant will be change — and so we're sure of one more thing: we have to be ready for surprises and a wide array of challenges.

After more than 38 years in uniform, I think I can safely say that not since periods of major war have we been so ready to face so many different challenges. Time after time, our military has met new challenges, and I might add, performed superbly. Not only have they successfully upheld and advanced our interests, but in the process they have created a new world standard for military excellence.

Today I would like to offer you a report card on our Armed Forces, and discuss some of the topics that interest you: security challenges; readiness; and modernization.

It is all too easy to overlook the fact that today the United States and our Allies are much safer than we were in the dark days of the Cold War. And one of the great strategic benefits from the end of the Cold War is that we been able to safely cut our forces. Since 1989 we have reduced our active all-volunteer forces by some 700,000 people, about a third of the active force. Our cuts were larger than the British, the German, the Dutch, and the Danish armed forces put together! Or all the doctors and dentists in the United States, or all the bartenders and bus drivers in the United States, the two professions that keep Washington DC moving!

In terms of combat structure the Army went from 18 active divisions to 10, a reduction of 45 percent. The Navy went from 566 ships to 354, a reduction of 38 percent. And the Air Force went from 36 to 20 fighter wings, a reduction of 45 percent. The defense budget has been reduced by 40 percent in real terms. We now spend less of a percentage of our national wealth — only 3.2 percent — on defense than at any time since before the Second World War. All these are dramatic reductions, reductions which in the past have always resulted in a nosedive in our capability and readiness. But not this time.

With hard work, sound leadership in the field and a high degree of support from two Administrations and the Congress, we have for the first time in our history been able to manage a huge postwar drawdown. We've created a much smaller but highly capable and highly ready force. Pound for pound, man for man, woman for woman, I believe we are more capable than we were during DESERT STORM. In fact we are spending more on readiness now than during the Reagan years.

This is a remarkable success story. And it's a good thing that we stayed ready because in the wake of the Cold War came not peace but all types of conflict and disorder. Today's force has successfully engaged in over 50 contingency operations since Operation DESERT STORM. On a typical week over 40,000 service men and women are participating in 15 separate operations around the globe.

Last spring's Noncombatant Evacuation in Liberia is typical of these operations. With almost no notice the United States, responding to a call to evacuate American citizens, formed a joint task force from units in Italy, in the Adriatic, in Germany, in the U.K., and in the United States. The first units were on their way in hours. Our joint task force — Navy Seals, Army paratroopers and Special Forces, an armada of ships and transport planes — evacuated 2,300 citizens from 68 countries. Although there was lots of gunfire and more than a few close calls, the evacuees and the Task Force returned safely.

Few people in the United States even took notice of this highly complex operation. The American people have simply come to expect such skill and professionalism from our Armed Forces.

We have done some missions so well, most of you have completely forgotten about them.

Take the mission in the Sinai for example. There we have had nearly 1,000 troops assigned since 1982, and we rotate these individuals every six months. That means that more than 30,000 Americans have served in the Sinai. But have you ever heard of a single incident?

Today one of our most closely followed military efforts is in Bosnia, where nearly 18,000 service men and women perform their military tasks as part of a 32-nation peace implementation force. There is no question about the success of IFOR. And so it is useful to understand why it is that IFOR succeeded where UNPROFOR failed.

The first reason is the close coordination between the diplomat and the soldier during the crucial negotiations. The second reason is that, unlike UNPROFOR, IFOR had a very clear mission to include specific tasks to be performed. That is exactly what is needed to keep a force from sliding into mission creep. Finally, IFOR had a straightforward chain of command, robust rules of engagement and sufficient force to get the job done.

These are lessons that we must not forget in all our subsequent operations. However, many problems remain.

While national and regional elections have been held municipal elections had to be postponed. Civilian tasks have not kept pace with the military tasks, especially building of political structures and the establishment of law and order. Civil reconstruction has lagged. The possibility of interethnic violence in Bosnia was, is, and will continue to be, significant.

Overcoming this hatred engendered by a savage civil war will be a tough task. Probably the best thing we can do is get their minds off the violence and get them involved in rebuilding their country.

As you all know we have replaced the Implementation Force in Bosnia with a new force and a new commander to support a new mission in Bosnia. We call this a stabilizing force, or SFOR, designed to ensure the right conditions exist for political and economic initiatives to proceed. The stabilization force contains about 31,000 multi-national forces, with 5,000 operational reserves nearby and 1,000 support personnel out-of-area. The U.S. contribution is 8,500 inside Bosnia, with logistics support outside Bosnia, air support from Aviano, and a Carrier Battle Group.

In approximately one year we hope to replace the 31,000 with a force of 13,500, with a U.S. contribution of approximately 5,000 Americans. Its primary mission will be to deter, with a June 1998 target date for wrap-up. Throughout the whole process we will continually reassess our progress to ensure we are achieving objectives and determine if we can transition to lower force levels sooner. The stakes are high! Finding the right answer will not only decide peace and stability in Bosnia but will influence the future strength of NATO and thus the contours of a future Europe.

The situation in the Middle East also remains problematic. Saddam Hussein continues to pose a serious threat, though not on the same scale as in 1990. Our operations in Iraq require substantial resources, not only from the U.S. but from our partners in the area as well. These include hundreds of flights a day, thousands a year, from fixed bases and carriers. In Southern Iraq alone we've flown over 120,000 sorties to date. And we've conducted three major deployments of ground troops to the region since the end of DESERT STORM. Because of our vital interests in Southwest Asia and the Gulf area, a strong presence will be needed for some time to come.

And because America's leadership is so important our service men and women today serve with great distinction, not just in Europe and the Middle East, but in other parts of the world where our interests are important; whether dampening conflict in the Taiwan Straits, deterring aggression in Korea or helping to fight the drug war in Latin America. None of this would be possible without our unmatched military capabilities and our high levels of readiness.

But now the question before us is whether we can maintain this readiness in the future? That will depend on the future security environment, its challenges and our estimate of the force that we will need to meet the challenges ahead. To that end we have already begun to work on the Quadrennial Defense Review with the goal of completing it this spring.

In preparation for this soup-to-nuts review, the first task was to look at the future security environment out to nearly 15 years to the year 2010. In our internal review we concluded that for the U.S. Armed Forces, the world between now and then will be at least as challenging as the present one.

While we can take comfort from the absence of superpower competition we will also have many security-related concerns. In the next 15 years we see the further development of a complex world of many asymmetrical powers, a world marked by ethnic and religious-based conflicts and influenced strongly by non-state actors.

Adding to the soup, there will undoubtedly be significant leadership and regime changes in North Korea, Cuba, China and many countries in the Middle East. At the same time, in the developed world the population will age, putting greater strains on pension systems and entitlement programs and creating downward pressure on budgets for foreign and defense policy. Technologically we see dangers related to the spread of weapons of mass destruction, the vulnerability of our data processing infrastructure, and the growing sophistication of terrorist movements.

And our military will be influenced by what some call a "Revolution in Military Affairs" — rapid and profound progress in the marriage between information technologies and precision strike capabilities. The good news is that we are on the leading edge of that revolution. The bad news is that the entry barriers to this revolution are relatively low, and in this century no leader in military technology has ever gone unchallenged. In the final analysis, out to 2010, our forces in the field are likely to face a range of threats, from terrorists to rogue states with weapons of mass destruction to potent regional powers, or even emerging peer competitors.

With that as a given our forces in the future must be able to prevent threats from arising by shaping the strategic environment; to deter threats if they emerge; and if necessary to use force to defeat these threats whenever and wherever important interests are at stake.

To meet this challenge three key tasks must be accomplished. First the U.S. must maintain its current major alliances in Europe, Asia, and its coalition in the Middle East. These alliances ensure the benefit of collective action. Our cornerstone alliance in the west is NATO. Contrary to all of the experts of a few years back it is not disappearing.

Rather it is getting stronger, enlarging its membership and reaching out to other nations through the Partnership for Peace.

The basic decision to enlarge that Alliance was made some time ago and reconfirmed at the Bergen ministerial in September. It is no longer an issue of "if" but of "when" and "who." A key challenge is to ensure that NATO enlargement is not seen as a measure taken against any state but rather a measure taken for peace and security on the continent.

At the same time we need to ensure we do not allow the Partnership for Peace program to "die on the vine." As NATO enlargement begins the rest of program may atrophy. PFP was supposed to create patterns of behavior by offering incentives so we could go forward with enlargement. It is important to have a process to ensure qualitative advances in relationships continue for those who don't join in the first or second round.

We must have something to offer, some advantage to continuing friendly, productive relationships. But NATO enlargement must also be seen in relationship to a second major task for future U.S. national security policy: engagement with the great powers. Russia today is fraught with problems, mostly economic. The Russian military is unhappy and unstable due to wage arrears and underfunding for readiness. The influence of organized crime encourages government corruption. We need to help their transition to a market economy and democratization so we don't end up with an adversarial relationship.

Our engagement activities with Russia are key to the continued building of trust between our nations. Our cooperation on the control of nuclear weapons and materials is a very successful initiative. And who could have imagined ten years ago that a Russian brigade would work side-by-side with a U.S. armored division as part of a NATO-led operation in Bosnia?

The joint patrols of Americans and Russians have done a lot for IFOR's reputation. And this kind of engagement will also help to break down the barriers between us and between Russia and NATO. Soon I hope, NATO and the Russian armed forces will open liaison offices at each other's headquarters. The Secretary of State has proposed formalizing the relations between NATO and Russia with a charter that would create standing arrangements for consultation and for joint action.

In all, while we intend to enlarge NATO we also intend to build security in Europe, not against Russia, but with Russia.

In a similar vein, peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region will be strongly influenced by U.S.-Chinese relations.

The United States is firmly committed to continuing its policy of engagement with China. Engagement on security matters will be difficult. China's territorial claims in the South China Sea, its policy toward weapons of mass destruction, and its fractious relations with Taiwan will make engagement challenging.

However, as Secretary Perry has noted, military-to-military relations are central to our policy of engagement with China. Contact between our military and China's may have a positive influence on the Chinese military — a key player in Chinese politics.

As a third major task we must ensure that our strength and our readiness match our worldwide interests. The readiness of our force will depend on many factors. Let me mention just two of them: force structure and modernization.

The issue of defense planning can be reduced to one simple question: How much is enough? This could be tough to decide when there is no overarching central threat.

During the Cold War the U.S.S.R. determined the force levels. After the Cold War, first in the Base Force and then in the Bottom Up Review, we sized against two nearly simultaneous major regional contingencies. Critics of this force have noted that a one-contingency force or a reinforced one-contingency force is all that is needed in the future. But these critics ignore how hard the present force is working to meet the requirements of lesser contingencies.

Last year, for example, on the average soldiers and marines deployed for around 140 days. On any given day over half of our Navy's ships are underway with more than a third of the total forward deployed. The Air Force, with a third less people than during the Cold War, has more than quadrupled the number it habitually deploys on operations.

These facts all support one conclusion: the force structure today is being worked to its capacity. Readiness for multiple contingencies is the most important reason to maintain a strong force structure. I am not talking about conceptual requirements here. For example, in the fall of 1994, in response to heightened threats, we deployed deterrent forces to both Korea and Iraq. Remarkably, just a few weeks before those deployments we had dispatched a humanitarian mission to Rwanda, and while that was still going on, a force of some 21,000 personnel to Haiti.

The size of our force today is not a luxury but a practical requirement. Farther out in the long-term future there are

promising technologies that will allow us to maintain the same capabilities with a smaller force. And that brings us to the issue of modernization.

Today's modernization program will be the bedrock of tomorrow's readiness. But modernization presents us with a very big challenge — one area where we have to give ourselves an incomplete.

In a restrictive budget environment we must now turn to replacing old equipment and sustaining a prudent modernization program. During the downsizing we were able to hold back on buying new equipment and hold back on modernization because sufficient equipment had been freed up from units that were being deactivated.

Now this windfall has passed and many of the remaining systems, most purchased during the Reagan years, are slated to reach the end of their service lives over the next 10 years. Today our procurement spending is, in real terms, lower than it was before the Korean War. I told Congress last winter that to ensure the readiness of tomorrow's force we would have to increase procurement spending by approximately 15 to 20 billion dollars annually.

And this will have to be done without increasing our "top line." To accomplish this will take revolutionary new management techniques, outsourcing and acquisition reform. Additionally, more bases will have to be closed, more functions privatized and more equipment and services purchased off-the-shelf. Without reducing force structure we will have to trim manpower. We must also continue the restructuring of our reserve forces to bring them into line with our strategic requirements.

It seems clear to me that the ball is in our court. If we are to achieve our vision of maintaining our position as the world's premier fighting force we need to become as innovative as American industry.

Let me close by what I hope amounts to preaching to the choir.

The American people have a great stake in peace and stability around the world. A third of America's national product depends on international trade. And we are, and will remain for the foreseeable future, the richest and most powerful nation on earth.

Without American leadership, international security would suffer. And in the long run more trouble abroad means more trouble at home. We will continue to press international organizations and our allies to do more in the name of international security. But overall, we must never forget that America puts the most into international security because America gets the most out of a more secure and a more stable international system.

Tomorrow and into the future, the United States must continue to lead, and to do that we must continue to support and maintain a strong and ready military, with let me add, strong and productive service academies.

For almost two hundred years, West Point graduates have ensured our ability to do just that. And I have great confidence that your future contributions as leaders of character who serve the common defense will more than live up to West Point's great legacy from the past.

**Defense Special Weapons Agency
McLean, Virginia
7 February 1997**

Not too long ago, I was the guest speaker at a luncheon of 300 military spouses from the Washington area, and for the very first time my wife did the introduction. But instead of the standard introduction, she proceeded to tell everyone about all the skeletons in my closet. So I was looking forward to Gary's introduction, because I thought he would stick to a straight military introduction, so I could give him an "A" for judgment.

Let me begin with a very obvious and very pleasant thing, and that is to say "congratulations" to the Defense Special Weapons Agency on 50 years of outstanding service to our nation.

But as we all know, the Special Weapons Agency like the "Pentagon," isn't an entity. So when I talk about this Agency, I am really talking about the efforts of some 1,000 super Americans who have contributed to this success story. A group of very dedicated professionals from a wide variety of disciplines that come together for the purpose of contributing to National Defense and maintaining stewardship of some of our nation's most important programs and capabilities. And what an outstanding job you have done. On behalf of the Joint Chiefs I applaud your outstanding success.

Now, today's symposium focuses on the lessons of the past 50 years and on the challenges of the 21st Century. I know that Dr. Wickner has already talked about DSWA's history so I will make an effort not to duplicate his remarks. I discovered a long time ago that it is probably prudent not to anger anyone who might actually know how to make a nuclear bomb. For this insight, I give myself an "A" for judgment.

Rather today, let me offer you my perspective on the changing nature of the strategic landscape and the enduring challenges to our National security.

The 19th century author Ambrose Bierce wrote about the future with tongue-in-cheek when he defined it as, "That period of time in which our affairs prosper, our friends are true, and our happiness is assured." And I think you will agree that this in a way, was our perception of the future after the collapse of communism.

It is safe to say that most of us, military and civilian alike, anticipated a relatively benign post Cold War environment. We can all remember the discussions about the peace dividend, the spread of democracy, and the anticipated growth of free market economies. And just as they had in the past, many of the experts heralded a new phase of international cooperation that some argued would negate the need for large militaries and outdated alliances like NATO; remember?

This general euphoria, once again, led some people to believe that arms control agreements would replace force structure, international organizations like the United Nations would peacefully settle all manner of disputes, and economic interdependence would temper hostilities. But you know as well as most that this is not the environment that emerged.

So while the optimists were celebrating the end of the Cold War and trying to convince us that "our happiness was assured," let's remember a useful definition, "An optimist is a person who has never had much experience." After 39 years in uniform and lots of experience, I can tell you that tougher challenges lay ahead and our best information and estimates of the years just ahead continue to support that judgment.

For as we look out at the strategic landscape for the next 15 years, we see a world being shaped by today's readily identifiable trends in demographics, economics, politics, culture and technology.

In a broad sense, I would characterize the world we expect in 2010 as more multi-polar with new centers of power and influence, but none besides the U.S. with the status of a true global power.

Attempting to pursue coherent U.S. policies in the new environment will continue to be particularly challenging. Because instead of uniting around common political ideologies or geography, the unifying factor between new coalitions may be religion, ethnicity, natural resources, economics or any number of future issues.

In addition to having to deal with individual states, the U.S. will find itself dealing with a large number of different international groups who also seek to influence global security issues. From multi-national corporations on one extreme to international organized crime on the other, new coalitions will arise, making pursuit of foreign policy much more difficult. The spread of information and communication technologies will most certainly increase interaction across national borders, coalescing large groups of people with common interests and serving to strengthen new "virtual" power centers.

In some regions of the world, global economic growth will propel some nations into a new era of prosperity. New wealth will provide these developed states with distinct choices between funding investment in infrastructure, social welfare, or new military capabilities. But if things are looking up in the developed world, I am not as optimistic about the developing world.

The experts tell us that by 2010, the global population will grow by 25 percent, with by far the largest increase occurring in the developing world. In a world with more than 7 billion people, we expect to see increased migration to urban areas in developing states as many of these people try to compete for limited jobs and a share of scarce resources.

Experience tells us that several things can happen when states cannot provide for their own people. The fragile society may collapse into political chaos, providing a ripe environment for internal conflict; the citizens might begin migrating to other states, leading to additional strains on neighboring economies; or the leadership might attempt to divert attention away from internal problems by rallying the population against a fictitious "enemy of the state." Any of these situations may result in humanitarian disaster or conflict that potentially affect American interests.

But even in this difficult new world, a world where clear distinctions between threats to our security from beyond our borders and the challenges to our security from within our borders are blurred, some things remain constant, and those constants are our vital national interests.

As President Clinton stated in the National Security Strategy, "Protecting our nation's security our people, our territory, and our way of life is still our foremost mission and constitutional duty." And nothing will be more challenging to the protection of our citizens, soldiers, and our way of life than the threats of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism.

The fact is that nuclear weapons will remain very much a part of the "real world" of 2010, because this is not a problem with an easy solution. For the past 30 years, every administration has pursued the same dream, the safe and verifiable elimination of nuclear weapons from worldwide arsenals. And we are making progress.

From a Cold War high of more than 20,000 U.S. nuclear warheads, the U.S. has dismantled thousands of tactical nuclear warheads, destroyed hundreds of strategic delivery systems, and eliminated 90 percent of its theater nuclear weapons. From the Euro-strategic Pershing II missiles to the nuclear shells for howitzers, the vestiges of the Cold War have vanished into the night. No one knows this better than those of you sitting in this audience today, because the Defense Special Weapons Agency has been heavily involved in supporting the process.

We have worked diligently with Russia to achieve mutually beneficial reductions in our respective arsenals. The foundation for this effort was codified in the Treaty on Nuclear Nonproliferation, demonstrated the first concrete results in the INF Treaty and START I, and today, continues in START II.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction program undertaken with Russia and some states of the Former Soviet Union has facilitated the return to Russia of over 3,000 warheads from Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. This included the removal of 1,027 former Soviet missiles from their launchers and elimination of more than 800 strategic launchers and bomber aircraft. The trick now is to get Russia to ratify START II so we can quickly move on to START III.

But at the same time, we must remember that we are not the only nuclear-armed nations in the world. Others already possess nuclear weapons or are devoting significant resources to acquiring a nuclear capability.

Nuclear mythology has taught these nations that like Jason's quest for the "golden fleece," the "atomic fleece" confers certain powers upon those willing to endure the odyssey. Unfortunately, after watching the Titans duel for 50 years, they have learned the wrong lessons and demonstrated they have short memories. Because as one American novelist once noted, "What has kept the world safe from the bomb since 1945 has been the memory of what happened at Hiroshima." But that memory is fading.

So in addition to an unwillingness to participate in the arms control process, some nuclear-armed countries condone through their actions the proliferation of nuclear materials and equipment to potentially dangerous states. Given the potential for a nuclear-armed Iran, for example, looming on the horizon, I prefer a national security strategy that offers America a reasonable opportunity to deter and if necessary, retaliate against the use of nuclear weapons. From my perspective, nuclear proliferation is a clear and present danger to our society now and in the future. A danger that cannot simply be "wished away."

Many of us look forward to the time when the United States no longer has to worry about nuclear dangers. But until that moment, the United States must continue to pursue a safe and verifiable arms reduction program while maintaining a suitable defense. Until someone can convince me that deterring the use of weapons of mass destruction is no longer a valid component of the National Security Strategy of the United States, I stand behind the safe and thoughtful arms control strategy established by the President.

The challenge for this great Agency is to ensure that as we begin to focus on further reductions in our nuclear stockpiles that you never lose sight of the awesome responsibilities associated with our collective stewardship. After all, whether you are responsible for 27,000 weapons, 10,000 weapons, or just a thousand weapons, the safety, security, and reliability of our nuclear arsenal demands the same attention to detail as it has for the past 50 years.

Since the dawn of the atomic age the American people and the military have relied on you for the safe stewardship of our nuclear stockpile, critical research, and operational support. These core missions of DSWA will endure for quite some time.

But perhaps even more challenging than the danger of nuclear proliferation, is the problem of chemical and biological weapons, especially when they are mated to sophisticated delivery systems or placed in the hands of terrorists.

While the critical components required for the assembly of nuclear weapons are controlled by a few select nations, almost anyone with the desire and a few hundred thousand dollars can begin the production of chemical and biological agents. By one estimate, nearly 50,000 different facilities around the world could potentially produce at least one type of chemical weapon agent. Not only does this make international policing of such programs difficult, but it dramatically increases the odds that our forces will face chemical or biological agents in future operations.

Chemical and biological weapons have often been described as the "poor man's" nuclear bomb. In the future, some nations will use these weapons not only as cheaper alternatives to nuclear programs, but as ways to further complicate U.S. military operations. This is a very real threat.

The key to effective planning for the operational challenges posed by weapons of mass destruction begins with a good analysis of the threat and its implications for our future strategy. As a result of close cooperation between the Joint Staff and the CINCs, we have established a priority list of capabilities required by military forces.

At the top of the list are improvements to chemical and biological detection equipment and ballistic missile defense, followed by improved capabilities to identify and destroy both underground and above ground WMD targets. This Agency's mission of helping the warfighter achieve high confidence kills of WMD targets on the ground is impor-

tant to our counter-proliferation mission. I salute the progress being made in this area and urge you to continue innovating.

When taken together the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons is quite a challenge. This is why President Clinton has worked hard to establish the groundwork for building a new consensus within the United States and with our allies on counter-proliferation policies and objectives.

Counter-proliferation affects virtually every aspect of the defense mission and requires a broad range of capabilities in order to effectively respond to the threat. In Fiscal Year 1997, the Department of Defense invested just under \$4.3 billion in counter-proliferation related programs. These funds are important contributions to our coordinated national investment strategy for counter-proliferation. A bipartisan commission of Congress recently reaffirmed the importance of this program when at the top of its list of vital national interests, it placed "Preventing and deterring the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons attacks on the United States."

Finally, let me say a few words about the last challenge impacting the future of military operations and DSWA. Of course I'm referring to the problem of terrorism.

Thirty years ago, if some political zealots wanted to use terror to influence U.S. policy or achieve some limited objective they had a relatively few, unsophisticated tools at their disposal. Today the problem of terrorism and the issue of force protection are much more complex.

Those out to do us harm are no longer just crackpots with a couple of Molotov cocktails. These are people with access to very sophisticated information and technology. They are using the Internet and cellular phones as enabling technologies. They have the knowledge and resources to construct bombs of immense destructive power, like those we saw in Oklahoma City, the World Trade Towers, and Khobar Towers. As I mentioned earlier, these hostile groups are increasingly operating more globally in well-connected networks.

Adding to the danger and the growing effectiveness of terrorists is the level of financial support many of these groups are receiving from private sources and hostile states. Unable to compete with the United States militarily, nations like Iran are spending millions of dollars each year in an attempt to counter U.S. influence. These states try to achieve their policy objectives by finding small groups to do the dirty work for them. This is a trend that will continue.

What these rogue states fail to understand is that in the history of the United States, these types of events have only served to strengthen American resolve and determination.

I travel all over the world talking about our joint warfighting team and what it means to the security of America. Combating terrorism must also be a team effort, but the team has got to be much larger than just the Services. If we truly intend to defeat those that want to do us harm then we need to enlist the help not only of the Services, but of Congress, law enforcement agencies, industry, and proven performers like the Special Weapons Agency.

A good example of the type of cooperation we need can be seen in the relationship between J-34, the new Combating Terrorism organization on the Joint Staff, and those of you here at the Defense Special Weapons Agency. Working together, we are establishing a regular schedule of assistance visits for our facility commanders by your Agency's assessment teams.

These assessment teams will provide commanders with feedback on the effectiveness of force protection measures at their installations. But this isn't all they will do. Helping our commanders solve problems will be the most important part of their job. Whether it is understanding what kind of new protection systems are available, or getting help with pushing requests through the chain of command, these teams must be dedicated to providing the best support possible to our forces.

So to those of you involved in this effort, let me say that nothing you will do in your careers may be as important as the task at hand. We cannot leave ourselves vulnerable to terrorist threats. We owe it to all our great people around the world and their families, to ensure we have done everything feasible to provide for their safety.

I can't think of any better group of people to help us tackle this problem than those of you here at DSWA.

And in this regard here is a new challenge for DSWA. Right now, if someone wants to talk to the experts on maneuver warfare, aerial combat, or naval warfare, they come here to the United States. If they want to buy the best information technologies or most effective weapon systems, they come to the United States. But when they want to learn about force protection and anti-terrorism where do they go? Well to Israel and perhaps the United Kingdom. My challenge to you is to help us change this state of affairs.

In the future, when someone is interested in talking to the experts about force protection, I want them to first think about the United States military and DSWA; team members in perhaps the most important battle we will face for some time. This is my challenge to you here today.

So where does all this leave us?

The bottom line is that we undoubtedly face a more complex and even more dangerous world in 2010 than we face today. It will be a world where the United States could be confronted with a wide array of non-traditional challenges while some current threats, such as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism will endure.

But let me be clear about one thing. Amidst all of the talk about tomorrow's dangerous world, it is all too easy to overlook the fact that today the United States and our Allies are much safer than we were in the days of the Cold War. As Winston Churchill once remarked, "These are not dark days, these are great days. The greatest days our country has ever lived."

Right now the United States finds itself in something of a "strategic pause." Without a monolithic threat to the national security, we have a unique opportunity to position ourselves for the future. The Special Weapons Agency must be a key player in helping us prepare for the uncertainties we face, and will face in the years ahead.

We are who we are today because of choices we made yesterday. Likewise tomorrow will become the result of today's choices.

When I was drafted in 1958 and sent to Alaska for my first assignment, I soon found out that there were only two seasons — winter and July. As the backroads began to thaw, they would become muddy and vehicles traveling through the backcountry would leave deep ruts. The ground would freeze hard during the winter months and the highway ruts became part of the traveling challenge.

I'll never forget a sign I once saw my first winter that read, "Driver — please choose carefully which rut you drive in, because you'll be in it for the next 20 miles."

Today we must choose carefully the path we are about to take. For our choice will control us for the next 20 years.

Let me once again congratulate all of you from the Defense Special Weapons Agency on the indispensable role you and your predecessors have played the past fifty years in helping our forces achieve new levels of combat capability and safeguarding America's nuclear deterrent. Your new challenge is to not lose sight of the importance of your historical mission while helping us achieve the new capabilities we require as America begins the 21st Century.

Good luck in all your endeavors and once again thank you for your contributions. I look forward to another 50 years of excellence.

**Annual Posture Statement
Washington, DC
12 February 1997**

I am proud to report to you that the United States' military remains the finest military force on earth. Time and again this past year, the 3.1 million members of the Total Force performed superbly in a variety of challenges around the globe. Success was due in large measure to the strong support of Congress, the Administration, and the American people. But more importantly, the force succeeded because of quality people, outstanding unit leadership, and its unique ability to adapt and persevere in an environment characterized by change and uncertainty.

As busy as the force has been and with all of the talk about today's dangerous world and the difficulties Americans have faced, it is too easy to overlook the fact that today the United States and its Allies are much safer than they were in the dark days of the Cold War. This "strategic pause," where the United States has no adversaries who are global powers, is providing us with the time to regroup, reflect on the challenges ahead, and prepare America's forces for the next millennium.

One of the strategic consequences of the post Cold War period is that the U.S. has been able to reduce military force levels. Since 1989, the active all-volunteer force has been reduced by 700,000 people — about a third of the active force. The Army has gone from 18 active divisions to 10, a 45 percent reduction; the Navy from 566 ships to 352, a 38 percent decline; and the Air Force, from 36 to 20 fighter wings, down 45 percent. These are the lowest force levels since before the Korean War. The Defense Budget has also been cut by about 40 percent since 1985. In FY98, it will represent only 3.0 percent of the Gross Domestic Product, the lowest since before World War II.

The force drawdown these past few years has not been an easy experience for military members. Many outstanding Americans were asked to leave the service of their country, thousands of whom had hoped to make the military a career. But through all this, the great people in uniform have persevered and once again confirmed the importance of American leadership in a number of contingencies around the globe.

OPERATIONS

America's military today is performing more missions, in more places than it did during the Cold War, and is doing so with significantly fewer personnel. Yet our men and women have performed brilliantly from one end of the world to the other, with Bosnia standing as a prime example.

BALKANS

Fifteen months ago in many Bosnian towns and cities, artillery fire was killing men and women in their homes and snipers often shot children playing in the streets. Atrocities were nearly a daily occurrence. U.S. forces went into Bosnia with the Implementation Force (IFOR), the NATO force tasked to accomplish the military tasks assigned in the Dayton Accords. It was a heavy force, involving nearly 20,000 U.S. military members who participated in keeping the factions separated, demobilizing forces, and achieving the other military goals of the Dayton accords.

The situation has changed dramatically since then. Today there are no weapons firing into towns and children once again play in the streets. The absence of war brought by IFOR offers a ray of hope for the future. On 20 December 1996, U.S. forces reached a milestone with the successful transition from the Implementation Force to a Stabilization Force (SFOR).

SFOR continues to build on the success of IFOR by providing time and an environment that will permit civilian initiatives to proceed. Up to approximately 8,500 U.S. personnel in Bosnia and an additional 5,000 in neighboring countries are supporting the Stabilization Force. SFOR is a mobile force that will concentrate on providing a safe and secure environment for civilian implementation of Dayton accords. The Commander, Stabilization Force (COMSFOR), is supported by an air operation built on the foundation of the successful Operation DENY FLIGHT; 1,800 U.S. personnel are involved in this facet of operations.

Our forces will be in place for 18 months. Every six months, a review of the security situation and civil initiatives will be conducted with the goal of moving to a deterrent force of reduced size.

Equally important to regional stability in the Balkans was Operation ABLE SENTRY. ABLE SENTRY is the U.S. contribution to the United Nations Preventative Deployment operation in Macedonia. 500 U.S. personnel joined 500 troops from other nations to ensure containment of the crisis in Bosnia.

MIDDLE EAST

Operations in the Middle East remained key to the preservation of regional peace and stability during 1996. Nowhere was this more evident than in efforts to deter additional Iraqi aggression and enforce U.N.-ordered sanctions and resolutions.

With the closing of the Military Coordination Center last year, the Secretary of Defense approved a modification of the mission in Northern Iraq. Since 1991, Operation PROVIDE COMFORT had provided humanitarian assistance to the Kurds and enforcement of the northern no-fly zone. The new Operation NORTHERN WATCH will focus exclusively on enforcement of the no-fly zone. Approximately 1,100 U.S. personnel support these efforts along with personnel and aircraft from the U.K. and Turkey.

Operation SOUTHERN WATCH remained in effect throughout 1996, tasked with ensuring compliance with United Nations' Security Council Resolution 949 and the 1994 U.S. demarche prohibiting the build-up of Iraqi ground forces south of the 32d parallel. SOUTHERN WATCH remains a multinational operation with participants from the U.K., France, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait.

Arabian Gulf maritime intercept operations continued to monitor shipping to ensure compliance with pertinent U.N. Security Council Resolutions. Although the U.S. assumed the bulk of responsibility for operations, during 1996, the U.K., Netherlands, Australia, Belgium, Italy, and France also participated.

In spite of international efforts to maintain the peace and force compliance with U.N. resolutions, Iraq still conducted military operations against its Kurdish population in the North. Operation DESERT STRIKE was the U.S. response to this aggression. Designed to deter Iraq from further offensive operations, U.S. forces struck military targets in Southern Iraq and expanded the no-fly zone in the South, further constraining Iraq's military.

The attack on the Kurdish population made it clear that the coalition could no longer guarantee the safety of civilians that had been working with the United States and international relief organizations to secure the peace. Operation PACIFIC HAVEN was initiated to evacuate and relocate former U.S. Government employees, political refugees,

and their families. Using facilities on Guam, the DoD in cooperation with the Department of State and other agencies, airlifted approximately 6,500 Kurds from Iraq to the island of Guam. 1,540 service members and 150 civilians supported this operation on Guam.

All these operations were in addition to on-going participation in the Multinational Force and Observer (MFO) missions in the Sinai. Nearly 1,000 U.S. forces man outposts in the Sinai. Since 1982, these troops have performed monitoring duties in accordance with the provisions of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN BASIN

The United States participated in a wide range of operations the past year in Latin America.

In Haiti, Exercise FAIRWINDS continues to help promote the building of a safe and stable environment. Approximately 500 U.S. medical, engineering, and security personnel currently are in Haiti. Together with monthly port calls from Navy and Coast Guard vessels, our forces perform select humanitarian projects designed to restore the devastated infrastructure and provide hope for the population struggling to emerge from this crisis.

Counter-drug operations continued in cooperation with regional governments in Operation LASER STRIKE. Working to support host nation counter-drug operations, LASER STRIKE focused on data collection and interdicting air and sea movement of illegal drugs. More than 500 U.S. personnel are making significant contributions to the development of a more comprehensive regional approach to counter-drug operations.

In Honduras, Joint Task Force Bravo (JTF-B) continued its 12th year of operations designed to promote cooperative security and regional stability. The 500 members of JTF-B conduct medical training, engineering operations, disaster relief, counter-drug operations, and CJCS-sponsored military exercises.

Another operation is SAFE BORDER, the U.S. contribution to monitoring the cease-fire along the Ecuador-Peru border. Established by the Rio Treaty, 60 U.S. personnel joined observers from Brazil, Argentina, and Chile to mitigate the conflict.

Finally, U.S. forces continued support to migrant operations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Only a few cases remain to be resolved after more than 58,000 Haitian and Cuban refugees transited the base between 1994 and early 1996.

But these were by no means the only operations U.S. forces participated in during 1996. In Southeast Asia, America continues to seek resolution of those missing in action through Joint Task Force Full Accounting. In less than 48 hours, our forces successfully evacuated 2,400 non-combatants from 68 countries in Liberia. In the Pacific, when tensions flared between China and Taiwan, U.S. forces quickly responded by diverting two carrier battle groups to the region to limit the chances of escalation. This kind of mobility and response acts to stifle any potential misperceptions about our ability to show resolve in areas where U.S. interests are at stake.

In support of domestic requests, men and women in uniform deployed to support the 1996 Olympic Games, fought fires in the West, provided flood relief in the Northwest, and assisted in clearing transportation routes during a particularly difficult winter in the Dakotas.

Today, over 40,000 men and women in uniform are deployed on 14 different operations. On an average day during the past year, 50,000 military professionals participated in deployed operations, and an average of 1,700 defense civilians also deployed to support the uniformed Services.

These numbers do not necessarily include the more than 250,000 forces forward stationed or routinely deployed at sea, that are in addition to the hundreds of local unit training deployments and Joint or multinational exercises that occur on a routine basis.

In Korea, for example, 36,000 U.S. forces stand ready with 600,000 troops from the Republic of Korea to ensure peace on the peninsula against 1.8 million North Korean forces. The instability in North Korea remains a concern as economic problems, food shortages, and energy deficiencies continue to worsen. Kim Jong Il's repressive regime and brittle ideology cannot address the current crisis. Thus it is imperative that our forces stand guard to protect a fragile peace.

During the past year, the importance of selected reserve component contributions to operations around the world also continued to remain key. Reserve units and individuals possess many of the capabilities needed for regional contingencies and crises, exercise support, and peacetime augmentation.

The Services continue to leverage the cost-effective contributions of the reserve components to compensate for a smaller Total Force. Support is funded by taking advantage of scheduled routine training periods, or through the Active component funding Reserve active duty days to meet surge requirements. As a practical example, last year, nearly 145

Guard and Reserve units activated to support operations in Bosnia. They have proudly met the challenge. The active force fully appreciates the contributions of America's citizen-soldiers.

The Services continue to take action to avoid unbudgeted costs of non-routine operations from absorbing funds required for readiness and modernization. In FY97 Congress appropriated \$1.3 billion to cover military operations anticipated at the time. Two unanticipated operations resulted in \$2.0 billion in unbudgeted FY97 costs: Iraq's provocation in the North and the President's approval of SFOR in Bosnia. To cover these costs, the Administration is requesting a FY97 \$2.0 billion supplemental appropriation.

The FY98 President's Budget requests \$1.5 billion in the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Account to complete operations in Bosnia, and an additional \$700 million for operations in Southwest Asia. This funding is important for the sustainment of critical operations and continued success in two regions.

Looking back on the operations this past year, it is gratifying to count the large number of successes. Key military determinants of success included: early involvement of military leaders in establishing a clear mission and achievable objectives; a clear chain of command; robust Rules of Engagement for operations and force protection; sufficient assets to achieve the objectives; outstanding pre-deployment training; and great people. These operations demonstrate both the importance to our nation's security of Peacetime Engagement, Conflict Prevention, and Forward Presence, as well as the necessity for our military forces to have the ability to conduct successful operations across the full spectrum of challenges.

As an integral part of a framework for success, commanders and planners must also give priority consideration to protecting our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

FORCE PROTECTION AND COMBATING TERRORISM

Few challenges loom as large as that of terrorism. The problem of terrorism and the issue of force protection are much more complex than they were 20 years ago. But terrorism isn't a new problem; it is simply an old problem getting worse. And so today, the Combatant Commanders and the Services are redoubling their efforts to provide America's men and women with the best possible force protection measures available.

Those out to do us harm are no longer just political zealots with a few sticks of dynamite. These are determined operatives, with access to very sophisticated information and technology. They construct bombs of immense destructive power like those used at the World Trade Center and Khobar Towers.

Equally challenging is the problem of chemical and biological weapons in the hands of terrorists or rogue states, dangers that U.S. forces may face in future operations. The Chemical Weapons Convention is an important step in implementing comprehensive measures to address this particular problem. I strongly urge your support for its expeditious ratification so that the U.S. has a strong voice in the control regime.

Adding to the danger is the increasing level of financial support these groups receive from private sources and hostile states. Unable to confront or compete with the United States militarily, rogue nations are spending millions of dollars each year in an attempt to counter U.S. influence. These states try to achieve their policy objectives by exploiting small groups to do the dirty work for them.

The Secretary of Defense commissioned the Downing Assessment Task Force to examine the facts and circumstances surrounding the Khobar Towers bombing. In response to the Downing Task Force, the Secretary designated me as his principal advisor and the Department's focal point for all matters related to force protection.

The Downing Report addressed 26 findings and 81 recommendations, 79 of which have been implemented. The actions taken in response to the Downing Report include organizational changes, policy changes, intelligence emphasis, increased use of technology, and additional physical security funding. The remaining two recommendations yet to be implemented involve contract deliveries for vehicle armor kits and personnel body armor which should be completed by 1 April 1997. The SECDEF determined one finding, dealing with the number of ambulances available in CENTCOM's area of responsibility, was faulty.

Organizational changes were made in the Joint Staff, combatant commands, and Services. I established a new Deputy Director for Operations for combating terrorism (J-34) that is now the focal point for coordinating the combating terrorism program among the Services and combatant commands. The Services and combatant commands also established focal points to ensure force protection is addressed in all daily operations and is a consideration during long range planning and funding.

Policy changes were codified in DoD Directive 2000.12, "DoD Combating Terrorism Program." This directive establishes the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs as the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense on antiterrorism force

protection matters. Additionally, it establishes new responsibilities for the Services, combatant commands, defense agencies, and OSD staff. These responsibilities range from implementation to assessment of antiterrorism programs.

A major policy change resulting from the Downing Report is the delineation of force protection responsibilities between the DoD and the Department of State. In the future, force protection for overseas DoD personnel will be provided by the department which is most able to provide the best security. Currently the Joint Staff and DoD are in the process of finalizing specific country-by-country agreements between DoD and the Department of State for the Arabian Peninsula. Similar agreements are being considered for the other overseas commands. In addition, DoD Directive 2000.12 also implemented DoD Handbook O-2000.12H, as the standard for antiterrorism force protection. The handbook establishes threat assessment, education and training, physical security, personnel protection, and weapons of mass destruction related standards for all of the Department of Defense.

Force protection training for DoD personnel and assessing the physical security of the installations on which they work are two critical areas of our overall personnel security program. Through the Services and CINCs, I have implemented a four-tiered program which includes individual, unit, commander, and senior executive level training.

Individual training is conducted by the Services upon entry into the military and throughout an individual's career in conjunction with various formal training courses. Unit level training is conducted by the individual organization. This includes formal training for the unit antiterrorism force protection instructors. Commander training is provided during the Services' pre-command training programs. This training focuses on the commander's force protection responsibilities as outlined in DoD Directives, Joint, and Service publications. Professional Military Education will also incorporate force protection into its curriculum. The final level of training is the executive level seminar for commanders involved in force protection planning and execution. Executive training culminates with a force protection wargame.

The Joint Chiefs are committed to ensuring the best available force protection equipment is available to U.S. forces. During several fora, military leaders noted the lack of "state of the art" anti-terrorism protection devices and challenged industry to draw on their extensive expertise to fulfill requirements. The response has been encouraging. But, before America procures new equipment, commanders must have a firm understanding of potential vulnerabilities and requirements.

This is where a new program of vulnerability assessment plays a key role. J-34, in close cooperation with the Defense Special Weapons Agency (the executive agent), is forming a number of assessment teams that will visit more than 650 facilities and installations on a prioritized schedule. Approximately fifty assessments are scheduled in 1997. Once the teams reach full strength they will complete 100 assessments per year. These teams will not only provide commanders with vulnerability assessments and recommendations, but most importantly will educate commanders on the types of force protection capabilities available to address shortfalls.

Timely intelligence information available at the appropriate level is a key factor in successfully combating terrorism at all levels of command. We have worked with the Defense Intelligence Agency to prioritize collection efforts in order to improve analysis of terrorist related events, both at the national and theater levels. At the national level, the Defense Intelligence Agency created the Office of Counterterrorism Analysis to provide support to the Joint Staff and combatant commands. Additional improvements were made by integrating the Deputy Director for Operation for combating terrorism (J-34) with the Defense Intelligence Agencies' Transnational Warfare Counterterrorism Office. This fusion of intelligence and operations functions improved both the analysis and dissemination of threat information to the Combatant Commanders. In addition, an Antiterrorism Watch Cell has been established which supports the National Military Command Center Watch Teams in the event of a terrorist incident.

Despite recent improvements in policy, procedures, and intelligence DoD's best efforts will not prevent every terrorist incident. Therefore, OSD initiated an effort to infuse technology improvements into force protection programs. Currently OSD has three programs; the Counterterrorism Technical Support, Physical Security Equipment Action Group, and Commercial-Off-The-Shelf Technology Insertion Program to address force protection technology improvements.

As the SECDEF's principal advisor, I play a strong role in this process. In November 1996, the Joint Staff sponsored a force protection symposium to discuss force protection requirements with industry. Industry is providing DoD with technological solutions and equipment to improve force protection. Evaluations of both off-the-shelf and emerging technologies are underway.

As the priority for force protection is raised we need to ensure it is also given a high budget priority. We initiated a review of future funding for force protection and have designated force protection as a major issue for the FY 1998-2003 program review. In the near term, a Combating Terrorism Readiness Initiatives Fund was authorized in direct support of a Downing Report recommendation to fund emergency or high priority antiterrorism requirements.

This effort was possible only because of the exceptional cooperation between the Services, Unified Commands, DoD and other government agencies, and commanders at all levels. The ultimate goal is make the U.S. military the premier anti-terrorism force in the world.

QUALITY PEOPLE — THE KEY TO SUCCESS

The ability of the United States military to sustain its record of operational success into the next century is based first and foremost on our ability to recruit and retain highly capable men and women. This is the reason my number one priority remains people — their recruitment and retention through strong support of the issues important to service members.

During the last fiscal year, the DoD met 101 percent of the recruitment goals. 96 percent of new recruits have high school diplomas as compared to 1974, when that rate was only 61 percent. 70 percent of these young people scored in the top three categories of the mental aptitude test. Twenty years ago in 1977, 32 percent of new recruits scored in the lowest recruiting category. Today it is less than 1 percent (0.3 percent).

However, emerging trends are cause for concern. The Services anticipate an increase in the number of new recruits they will need to sustain the force now that the drawdown is nearing completion. Moreover, the Services are going to continue to find themselves competing more with private industry for the best and brightest young people. This is especially true given that the soldier of the 21st century, just as the worker of the 21st century, will most likely require greater math, computer, and language skills.

But recruiting is only part of the picture. The Services must concern themselves with retaining these outstanding Americans once they enlist. Overall retention rates have increased the past year. The retention rate for DoD was the highest it has been during the past seven years. The Army and Marine Corps maintained retention rates near 83 percent, the Navy increased by 2 percentage points to 85 percent, and the Air Force increased 3 percentage points above last year, from 86 percent to 89 percent. This stability provides evidence of the dividends paid by investment in quality of life programs for America's service men and women, and reinforces the focus on these issues in the coming years.

QUALITY OF LIFE PROGRAMS

Looking out on the horizon, military operations will continue to demand great sacrifice and dedication from U.S. forces. It is important to reaffirm the importance of the top five "people" priorities: compensation; retirement; medical benefits; housing; and personal dignity.

Congress deserves much credit for supporting the 1997 pay increase and the additions to the Basic Allowance for Quarters. The FY98 budget funds a 2.8 percent pay increase and 3.0 percent in the out-years. But, it is bothersome that so many of the young enlisted men and women still have difficulties making ends meet.

When Congress made the decision to move away from the draft to an all-volunteer force, the demographics of the force changed as more people viewed service as a professional career. Forty-three percent of the force is now below 26 years of age. The Services now attract more young married couples, as opposed to the single draftees of years past. 61 percent of the active force is married, and together have more than 1.3 million children. Since the military reflects society in general, it should come as no surprise that 5 percent of the force are single parents, with all the challenges that accompany such status.

Congress and DoD should jointly explore solutions to the problem of adequate compensation for these young Americans. The arduous life style and devotion to duty asked of young men and women deserve a fair recognition of their efforts through adequate compensation.

Congress should resist pressures to make additional changes to the existing 20-year retirement compensation system. The foundation of the military pay system has historically been based on the concept of delayed compensation. The 20-year retirement system provides an incentive for members to make the Services a career. Reforms this past decade have already cut by over 20 percent the value of retirement for a member leaving at 20 years. The greatly reduced force levels of today will eventually result in savings in this area in the out-years. Any additional changes made now may have unanticipated consequences in terms of force retention, recruitment, and force composition down the road.

In light of decreasing military medical assets, maintaining an adequate level of health care for Service members, dependents, and retirees is a critical quality of life issue. With the drawdown and restructuring initiatives occurring throughout the Services, access to military medical facilities could become more difficult, especially for dual-eligible

retirees (those over 65 and Medicare eligible). Medicare subvention will allow retirees to enroll in TRICARE and have appropriate access to military facilities. Congress should support a subvention test as a means to maintain the good faith promise to retirees and validate cost estimates. The military's peacetime health care system maintains wartime readiness and is a key retention issue.

Again this year, the Services request your support for the continued improvement of military quarters and family support. In FY98, quality of life funding is continued in such areas as barracks and family housing, child-care, family support programs, and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) activities. The planned FY98 funding for replacement or refurbishment of 5,900 family housing units and 11,000 barracks living spaces is a program worthy of unanimous support.

But adequate pay, medical, and retirement benefits alone will not attract or retain the quality people we must have to sustain our armed services. We must create an environment that fosters an atmosphere of trust and respect for personal dignity.

The recent incidents of sexual harassment at training centers and hazing are particularly troubling because these events are not consistent with our values of integrity, moral courage, trust and confidence. Moreover, sexual harassment and hazing destroy teamwork, a key element of combat success. We have an absolute responsibility to ensure these events do not occur. The Chiefs and I reaffirm our zero-tolerance policy for discrimination, harassment, and all actions contrary to our core values.

Ours must be a military that any American can be proud to serve in. America's parents must be able to trust in our commitment to treat their children fairly and justly and provide them a safe, harassment-free environment.

READINESS

The ability to respond to national crises requires that readiness remain the Services' next priority. Today's force is among the busiest in our history. This fact presupposes a high level of readiness, but it also makes maintaining readiness a more complex task.

The Services made a determined effort to heed the warnings about a hollow force. Resolved to avoid the mistakes of the past, readiness accounts received top priority funding. This strategy paid big dividends in terms of mission success. However, readiness requires our constant attention as the tension between modernization, personnel programs, operations, and training becomes more acute.

OPERATIONS/PERSONNEL TEMPO

America's professional force maintained readiness the past year even with an increased level of tasking. The high OPTEMPO stressed our Operations and Maintenance accounts (O&M), as forces required additional supplies, maintenance, and training in preparation for impending taskings and exercises. In the budget, O&M receives a justified increase from \$92.9 billion in FY97 to \$93.7 billion in FY98. Each military Service is working to sustain high levels of readiness while implementing new initiatives to reduce costs.

The rotational nature of operations such as SFOR in Bosnia and the enforcement of the no-fly zones in Iraq challenged the operations tempo (OPTEMPO) and personnel tempo (PERSTEMPO). The regional CINCs and the Services continue to deftly manage these key issues to maintain the quality of the force. However, the increased time away from home brought on by frequent training events as well as actual operations can erode the quality of life and family unity of Service members.

Several processes and tracking mechanisms are being put into place in order to monitor the pulse of PERSTEMPO and attempt to alleviate hardships. As problems are identified, the Joint Monthly Readiness Review provides a forum for bringing them to the attention of the Services, OSD, and me for action. Initiatives are also underway to monitor those individuals in critical jobs that seem to get tasked more often than others. Prior to issuing deployment orders, the Joint Staff (J-3) in conjunction with the Service and CINC staffs, now discuss the impacts on PERSTEMPO and explore potential alternatives as required.

The Navy has defined and developed OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO programs aimed at meeting both DoD directed requirements and ensuring reasonable conditions for Navy families. PERSTEMPO exceptions are personally approved by the Chief of Naval Operations; last year there were only five. PERSTEMPO rose only slightly above the Navy goal of 50 percent of the time in home port, due primarily to meeting CINC requirements and unforeseen contingency operations.

Today's Air Force is very much an expeditionary force. It is 36 percent smaller, 66 percent less forward based, and has nearly five times more airmen deployed today than in 1989. Yet careful management has resulted in less than 3 percent of Air Force personnel exceeding the Chief of Staff's PERSTEMPO goal of 120 days per year away from home.

The Marine Corps deployment tempo (DEPTEMPO) for the past year once again demonstrated an ability to provide initial response to unanticipated contingencies, such as the crises in Liberia and the Central African Republic, while sustaining forward presence. All this despite a 12 percent decrease in force structure since 1989. On an average day, the Marine Corps has approximately 25 percent of the operating force deployed. Marine Corps EA-6B electronic warfare aircraft are good examples of assets in high demand around the globe. These units are carefully managed to ensure they meet both the Commandant's DEPTEMPO guidelines and the requirements of our Global Military Force Policy.

Last year, the Army remained a resilient quality force which deployed on an average day, over 34,000 soldiers, not including many soldiers already forward deployed in countries such as Panama, Italy, South Korea, and Germany. The average yearly deployment rate rose by more than 2 percent last year.

Although the Services carefully monitor the effects of increased PERSTEMPO, the adverse effects may not appear immediately. This is one reason the Joint Staff aggressively pursues PERSTEMPO measurement initiatives.

Family oriented programs are another area in which the Services are very aggressive. During on-going operations in Bosnia, family service centers setup counseling services in schools attended by children of deployed Service members. Additionally, American forces have access to on-line e-mail, morale calls to home, and Morale Welfare and Recreation (MWR) support facilities throughout the area of responsibility (AOR). Chaplain support during the Bosnia operations is particularly strong to both families and deployed members.

Readiness of the force is based on several components, but an important new element the past several years has been jointness.

JOINTNESS: TEN YEARS AFTER GOLDWATER-NICHOLS

The changes brought about by the Goldwater-Nichols Act have had a positive effect on our readiness and have become a major source of what we refer to as "jointness." The tenth anniversary of Goldwater-Nichols was celebrated with a symposium at the National Defense University. Several panels of distinguished speakers offered unique insights into the both the process and progress of Goldwater-Nichols implementation. The symposium was an opportunity to take a historical look at Goldwater-Nichols, the improvements in jointness that it brought about, and what remains to be accomplished.

Much has been accomplished. Jointness cannot be measured by the number of joint publications produced or by listing the new Joint Centers and organizations. Jointness is out in the field, in the air, and on the oceans. One only has to compare the inadequate level of air-ground cooperation in Grenada with the outstanding efforts in Haiti, where an Army light division deployed from an aircraft carrier, or look at Bosnia, where two successive commanders on the ground were admirals.

The effort to improve the military advice provided to the President, Secretary of Defense, and National Security Council is an important success story. The roles of the Chairman and Vice Chairman are well established and have produced tangible results. Additionally, the added voice in the resource allocation process that Goldwater-Nichols provided the CINCs has proven most beneficial.

Following Goldwater-Nichols, the Department of Defense revised its acquisition directives, thus helping ensure military requirements and mission needs are met responsively through cost-effective modernization programs. OSD has initiated very important acquisition reforms this year which will help us field the warfighting capabilities postulated in 2010.

Increasing the number of senior leaders who have significant Joint duty experience is still key to improving the process. A process is now in place to assess all joint manpower positions to ensure a particular manpower position provides sufficient joint expertise to be included on the Joint Duty List. An oversight board composed of eight Flag Officers or civilian equivalents has validated the process. The results of these Initiatives are being codified in a DoD manual covering the Joint Officer Management Program.

Joint doctrine has emerged as a central organizing force. Without establishing the basic beliefs about the best way to fight the Joint war, operations were in danger of falling victim to "doctrine du jour," the tendency to adopt ad hoc procedures. Developing Joint doctrine has not been an easy process by any stretch of the imagination. Nevertheless, the Services, CINCs, DoD Agencies, Joint Staff, and the Joint Warfighting Center have teamed to produce a large body

of authoritative Joint doctrine to enhance operational effectiveness. To date, 76 Joint doctrine manuals are in place and the body of approved Joint doctrine continues to evolve. The value of Joint doctrine has been demonstrated numerous times in deployed operations around the globe.

Joint education continues as a pillar of force readiness. The National Military Strategy requires an educated officer corps capable of coping with a broad range of operations while simultaneously shaping the strategic environment. Continued improvements to joint education programs will prove to be future force multipliers.

The Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) continues to evolve into one of the most useful tools available to the SECDEF, the Chairman, the Services, and CINCs. The JROC has grown from an acorn to a sizable oak tree in terms of responsibility and effectiveness. Now the JROC tree must grow to full maturity.

Within the context of strategic planning, the JROC has expanded its scope and focus dramatically over the past three years. It now plays an increasingly central role in two areas, one associated with the validation of mission needs for the acquisition process, and one related to the assessment of Joint warfighting capabilities. In both these roles, the JROC supports me in executing one of my important Title 10 responsibilities — to advise the Secretary of Defense on requirement priorities, assess military requirements for Defense Acquisition Programs, and provide the SECDEF with alternative program recommendations to achieve greater conformance with the priorities established.

Codifying the JROC and Chairman's role in the last Defense Authorization Bill, was an important step in the process. As Vice Chairman of the Defense Acquisition Board (and the only military member of that board) and my designated Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC), the Vice Chairman now plays a pivotal role in ensuring that we achieve the optimal military capability, at the right time.

The Joint Warfighting Capabilities Assessments (JWCAs) have provided an analytical foundation for JROC deliberations. The JROC oversees the JWCA process, directing assessments of specific Joint military areas. Through improvements in the JWCA process, the JROC has further increased the interaction with CINCs and the Services on warfighting capabilities and requirements issues. Additionally, the Joint Staff has been able to further integrate the JROC and JWCA process with the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS). This process continues to mature and gain relevance, facilitating consensus among the JROC, CINCs, and the JCS on military planning and requirements.

Readiness to conduct effective operations is also tied very closely to improvements in Joint training. This is where an aggressive program of Joint training and education initiatives is so important. These initiatives combine the teachings of Joint doctrine and Joint operations to fully utilize all aspects of Service capabilities as a Joint force. Professional Military Education programs have made great progress in educating officers about each Service's capabilities and the contributions that each brings to the full range of Joint operations. These programs provide a unique environment which allows future leaders to critically assess the status today, and think "out of the box" about the future. But the theoretical must be reinforced with the practical. During the past year, the Joint Staff continued efforts to fully integrate new modeling and simulation efforts. Additionally, the staff has taken steps that enable training efficiencies by matching training requirements to the exercise program. The feedback from the theater CINCs is positive and results from the Joint Exercise Program are encouraging.

Jointness is moving into the future, building on the core competencies of each of the Services. Continued cooperation will allow realization of the operational goal to achieve full spectrum dominance in the near term and out into the challenging future.

MODERNIZATION — EQUIPPING THE FORCE FOR THE 21st CENTURY

The most challenging aspect of modernization remains the continuing underfunding of our acquisition accounts. In my last two reports to you, I have stressed the need to raise procurement funding to a steady state of about \$60 billion per year. This is still an operative goal although the Quadrennial Review may adjust it to meet the dictates of a new or modified force structure.

This budget does not reach the target level of funding until 2001. While this is later than I think is optimal, I am encouraged that at least it is now accepted as a realistic, achievable goal. If we are to achieve this goal, as a minimum, we will have to cut out excesses and learn to work smarter.

As difficult as it is politically we will have to further reduce our infrastructure. The BRAC process reduced our base infrastructure by some 18 percent and should provide a net cost avoidance of \$14 billion between 1990 and the year 2001. But at the same time, while we cut these bases by a little less than a fifth, we also reduced the force by a third, and reduced our combat structure even more than that. The result is that we perhaps have more excess infrastructure

today than we did when the BRAC process started. In the short run, we need to close more facilities, as painful and as expensive as it is.

We also must change how we do business, relying more on outsourcing, privatization, and the procurement of off-the-shelf equipment and services. Where possible, we will also have to trim personnel end strength especially where technological changes such as improved weapons systems, afford us the possibility to consider fewer or smaller units.

During the last year, the Joint Chiefs and Unified Commanders established a common vision of future capabilities that will lead us in a common direction towards future warfighting concepts and complementary interoperable capabilities. In tandem with the great work being done by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, *Joint Vision 2010* provides the Services and Unified Commands the conceptual template to achieve dominance across the full spectrum of future operations. The implementation plan for *Joint Vision 2010* is already well underway and will ensure that the vision is turned into reality.

As the Joint Chiefs look to the future vision and requirements, the Chiefs also recognize that new technology is not the answer to all operational challenges. Some missions will still require forces to engage in many of the same activities they have had for the past 200 years. The Services remain committed to improving capabilities across the full spectrum of combat capabilities, not just on the high end.

Future modernization plans will be rooted in one of four key operational concepts contained in *Joint Vision 2010*: focused logistics; precision engagement; full dimensional protection; and dominant maneuver. Looking to the future, a few key areas require increased emphasis and wider support. DoD has already begun a number of initiatives to make these capabilities more affordable.

A top priority remains strategic lift, a substantial pillar of America's military strategy. The C-17 Globemaster III is an increasingly important component of America's strategic mobility fleet and today the program is in good shape. The C-17 program is executing a seven-year procurement for a total of 120 aircraft by 2003 (last C-17 delivered by 2004), saving approximately \$1 billion compared to annual lot buys. The C-17 program remains necessary to replace the aging C-141 fleet.

Strategic sealift is critical and requires additional attention. Over 95 percent of the equipment deployed during a major conflict will be lifted on ships. The Mobility Requirements Study/Bottom Up Review Update (MRS BURU) validated a need for 10 million square feet of surge capacity to move the forces for one Major Regional Conflict (MRC). This is the minimum surge sealift required for a single MRC, and it would be recycled for a second conflict.

In order to ensure appropriate types of vessels required, primarily Roll-on/Roll-off (RO/RO) ships, DoD embarked on an ambitious acquisition plan of organic sealift. The nineteen Large Medium Speed Roll-On/Roll-Off (LMSR) vessels which DoD will acquire by FY01 will be the centerpiece of America's strategic sealift capability. Upon delivery of the last ship, five million square feet of capacity will have been added to the fleet, three million square feet for surge and two million square feet for pre-positioned equipment. This program has enjoyed strong support from Congress in the past and is funded in the Navy budget. Keeping this program on track for a FY01 completion is essential and a top strategic lift priority.

In addition to the LMSRs, the study identified a need to add 19 smaller RO/RO ships to the Ready Reserve Force (RRF). This piece of the surge requirement has proved to be more difficult. Although we've added 14 of the 19 RO/ROs to the RRF since 1992, it is unlikely the Mobility Requirements Study/Bottom Up Review Update (MRS BURU) completion goal of FY98 for these ships can be met. The Joint, TRANSCOM, and Navy Staffs are looking at all options, including evaluation of commercial U.S. flag programs, not available at the time of the BURU, in order to fill surge requirements, to reach a capacity goal of 10 million square feet. DoD had been converting foreign built vessels in the absence of suitable U.S. built vessels. The requirement for five more RO/ROs, or an additional 550,000 square feet, remains today, but Congress has not authorized RO/RO acquisition the past two years. We need to remain committed to reaching the Ready Reserve Force capacity goal in order to close the gap.

My next priority focuses on providing U.S. forces with systems that enhance situational and battlefield awareness, and command and control. Several technologies will enhance both the ability to maneuver and engage precisely.

First, the exploitation of emerging Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) technologies offers the potential of becoming great force multipliers. The JROC has done an enormous amount of work appraising UAV programs and manned platforms in order to provide recommendations regarding the reconnaissance force structure necessary to support CINC requirements. Warfighters have a requirement for a tactical UAV and my top UAV priority is a system to support the ground commanders.

The JROC-chartered UAV Special Study Group is reviewing UAV programs to assess the proper funding priority for UAV programs. Once the Services establish that UAVs can carry the necessary sensors and meet mission require-

ments in anticipated weather conditions, DoD should move swiftly to evaluate the cost-saving tradeoffs between manned and UAV reconnaissance systems. I remain committed to fielding a UAV force that is interoperable among all Services as an important enhancement to warfighting capability.

Next, the ability to ensure precision engagement and dominant maneuver as described in *Joint Vision 2010* depends on providing an effective mix of both offensive and defensive information infrastructures. The fusion of all-source intelligence with the effective integration of platforms, command organizations, sensors, and logistics support will be what distinguishes the U.S. from second-rate military forces.

The Services have come a long way in this area the past ten years. The lack of interoperability between the Services' disparate command, control, communications, and computer (C4) systems was a major theme of the 1970s and 1980s. Compare this with the recent successes in Joint Task Force (JTF) operations across the globe, particularly in supporting the Implementation Force in Bosnia where the U.S. established a communications and information architecture that integrated hundreds of different systems from 32 different nations. The progress made in C4 coordination was as much a miracle as the successes in transportation and enforcement. In the future, Joint Task Force integration becomes even more dependent on information superiority and new communications solutions.

However, with technology advancing so rapidly, acquisition and budgeting processes may be inadequate to address C4 needs with the speed required. Potential opponents can buy state of the art C4 systems right off the shelf, but DoD requirements go through a lengthy acquisition and budgeting processes. This delay results in the warfighter often receiving "old" technology. The Services cannot afford the long lead-time of the system given the rapidly advancing status of C4 technologies. It seems prudent that where significant capabilities are commercially available in the open market, particularly when these capabilities are essential to the future vision, DoD could have a more responsive acquisition and budgeting process. This is an area that needs a hard look.

The military is also facing a new challenge from the commercial and international sectors over an issue no one anticipated 20 years ago: availability of the frequency spectrum. In the rush to provide "bandwidth" for the myriad of new communications and information systems flooding the worldwide market, governments are selling-off portions of the frequency spectrum. It is critical that future spectrum sales take the impact on defense systems into account. There is potentially a significant dollar impact involved in this issue. If DoD has to yield portions of the spectrum to new commerce, existing military equipment operating within these frequencies must be replaced with systems that can operate on other portions of the spectrum.

As the United States continues to improve its combat information and communication systems, an important consideration is the impact such modernization will have on friends and allies.

The United States is the world's leader in the exploitation of information technologies. This is evident in every facet of American life and is particularly true with respect to the military. Information dominance is the common thread running throughout the fabric of future operational concepts. As a result, the Services are making key investments in new information technologies, investments that will produce significant combat multipliers in the next century. Unfortunately, friends and allies are not proceeding at the same pace or with the same levels of interest.

The United States must ensure key information systems remain interoperable and complementary with allies. This is particularly important to the success of multinational operations. America's strategy must envision information architectures that avoid the same compatibility pitfalls encountered within our own Services in the 1970s and early 1980s.

Additional enhancements to the operational concepts of precision strike and full dimensional protection center on the recapitalization of our tactical aviation programs. The Joint Chiefs supported transitioning the Joint Advanced Strike Technology effort into an acquisition program.

The Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program is the benchmark for future Joint weapon system efforts. The JSF program will provide the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force with a critical, survivable, lethal, and highly interoperable multi-role strike capability. The efficiencies associated with this cooperative, Joint Service development approach are substantial and deserve support from Congress and the Administration. Additional aviation modernization programs and technology upgrades will be needed to ensure voids in capabilities do not occur in the next century.

Stealth technologies have provided America with an unmatched combat capability in the F-117 fighter and B-2 bomber. Low observable technologies will eventually be exploited in a wider array of combat systems including the F-22, naval vessels, tanks, ground vehicles, and the JSF. Both DoD and Congress should fully support leveraging this technology through continued investment. However, funding for additional B-2s is not in the best interest of the force. The limited procurement budgets can be put to better use on higher priorities.

One of those advancing priorities key to protecting our force is the development of effective Theater Missile

Defenses (TMD) for deployed forces. U.S. forces face danger from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their associated delivery systems. The JROC is monitoring progress in the TMD area and is taking the prudent course in relation to concerns about the priority of the National Missile Defense Program. For example, in FY 96, JROC actions prioritized funding for lower tier systems to address the near-term ballistic missile threat. Recently (24 Jan 97), the Navy Area Defense System successfully intercepted a ballistic missile in the first test of its new infrared seeker at the White Sands Missile Range. The Patriot Advanced Capability 3 system is scheduled to conduct its first test by this summer. Additionally, earlier this fiscal year, DoD increased funding for upper tier programs. This will accelerate the fielding of the Theater High Altitude Air Defense System (THAAD) and provide for additional risk mitigation testing of the Navy Theater Wide Defense System.

The NMD Deployment Readiness Program optimizes the potential for an effective National Missile Defense System. If the decision is made to deploy a NMD system in the near-term, then the system fielded would provide a very limited capability. If deploying a system in the near-term can be avoided, DoD can continue to enhance the technology base and the commensurate capability of the NMD system that could be fielded on a later deployment schedule. The objective here is to be in a position to be three years away from deployment, so America can respond to the emergence of a threat. This approach fields the most cost-effective capability that is available at the time the threat emerges.

The FY98 budget authority requested for ballistic missile defense is \$3.5 billion. During FY99-03, an additional \$17.9 billion is planned. Beginning with the FY 1998 budget, funding for Theater Missile Defense programs are in the appropriate Service accounts.

THE QDR

The Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) does not start with a clean slate, rather it begins with the fact that the U.S. currently has the best force in the world. America's military is the envy of the world because of what it can accomplish on a daily basis. It is not just the equipment that other nations admire. It is the organization, leadership, training, and the great people. Thus, the QDR must ensure that tomorrow's force is every bit as capable to protect America's interests as is today's force.

The QDR is a serious effort to examine strategies, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plans, management, and other elements. It will highlight what is right and those areas where change is required. If there is an opportunity to restructure ourselves to be better prepared to protect America's interests, then we will respond appropriately.

However, when the nation's security is at stake, changes have to be made carefully. American forces must have the capability to prevent future conflicts by shaping the strategic environment, deter conventional and nuclear war, and when necessary, fight and win the nation's wars.

These tasks underscore the need to maintain well-balanced forces to prevent conflict through engagement, deter conflicts before they start, or fight and decisively win those that do. In short, America must maintain a military capable of dominating an opponent across the full range of military operations. Mobility and forward deployment will be essential characteristics of the force.

Like mobility, forward deployment provides military commanders with several advantages. The ability to forward deploy forces, whether permanently, rotationally, or temporarily in the Pacific, the Middle East, and Europe dramatically reassures allies of America's commitment, reduces the response time to regional crises, signals a commitment to defend American interests, and moderates potential aggressiveness directed at friends and allies.

Prepositioning of equipment is a facet of overseas presence that demonstrates to allies the U.S. commitment to come to their aid if threatened or attacked. Prepositioning also gives the U.S. the ability to respond faster to a developing crisis and increases the ability to deter war.

The capabilities of forward-deployed units must be sufficient to quickly and decisively prevail across a wide range of potential operations. In the future, success or failure of operations may be determined by America's response in the first few hours or days of a crisis.

Forward deployment provides significant side benefits as well. A continuing program of engagement relying on military-to-military contacts, multinational exercises, and joint training opportunities provides the regional Combatant Commanders with the building blocks necessary for effective operations. The complex political demographics unique to each AOR are carefully considered in developing a proper level of joint and multinational exercises to support each CINCs engagement strategy. These programs enhance levels of trust between regional friends, strengthen command relationships, promote doctrinal and tactical awareness, and enhance the mission of conflict prevention.

The array of bilateral and multinational cooperative efforts this past year reinforces the importance of the alliances and partnerships that grow out of engagement programs. Nowhere is this more evident than in the cooperation between a rejuvenated NATO and members of the Partnership for Peace (PFP) program. America's active and reserve soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are establishing the ties so critical to ensuring a lasting peace on the European continent.

Today, the United States has the best military in the world. With continued support from Congress and key investments in quality people, readiness, and modernization, America's forces will remain preeminent in the year 2010 and beyond.

**97th Battle Standard Dinner
U.S. Merchant Marine Academy
Kings Point, New York
21 February 1997**

I want to thank Admiral Matteson and Midshipman Stout for their kind introductions and your warm reception. Listening to you I wasn't sure that you were talking about me. You made me sound so good.

A few months ago my wife Joannie wasn't so easy on me. I was invited to talk to a group of 300 or 400 military wives at an annual luncheon. And much to my surprise, my wife did the introduction, something she had never done before, nor ever will do again. For instead of talking about my military career, she started to tell all these strangers how I lost an academic scholarship in college because I couldn't maintain the minimum required grade point average. Now before I get in trouble with the Superintendent, I don't want any of you to think that the best way to become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs is to go on academic probation.

That aside, it's wonderful to be here to be able to spend this time with the future leaders of our maritime industry.

It is wonderful to be away from Washington even if only for a few hours. One of the reasons I'm so glad to be here is that last year my wife and I were attending an annual conference of the American Academy of Achievement, where each year we honored a group of outstanding young high school students. As we were looking for a place to sit down a young man invited us to join him: Midshipman Sam Stout. Never in my 39 years in the Service had I talked to anyone more excited about coming to an academy. I made up my mind right then and there that I was going to have to come to Kings Point and see just what kind of a place could get such an outstanding young man like Sam so excited about getting seasick and having his head shaved!

But after today after visiting Kings Point I understand.

Since the academy was first founded in 1943 it has grown majestically as building after building has been added. But as impressive and elegant as these buildings are, they are no more than piles of brick and concrete. They are but the places that hold the real treasure of this academy. The treasure that makes Kings Point such a center of excellence is its remarkable staff and faculty. It is they who pass on to each class their great gifts of knowledge and experience.

And speaking of passing on knowledge, I had the opportunity to read the "Bearings Book." Apparently this is "must reading" for all the plebes. I had just enough time to memorize the two most important sentences: "Go Mariners!" and "Beat Coast Guard!" I'm told that the basketball team successfully thrashed the Coast Guard this year once again driving home the point to Admiral Matteson that he had made a big mistake in choosing to attend a second-ranked school so many years ago.

I can't help but admire each and every one of you for the decision you made to by-pass the comforts of a normal university to attend one of the most challenging schools in our nation. And at the very same moment, each of you made an enormous and very noble commitment to serve our nation as a member of the merchant marine and naval reserve. I salute you all. So I can't imagine a finer way to end my visit here today than to spend a little time with the graduating class.

But before I talk about what's on my mind tonight, let me give my unconditional support to the mission of the United States Merchant Marine Academy and to all its graduates who have served this nation faithfully since 1943. These are difficult times for all the branches of the Government, not just the military Services, as our leaders try to delicately balance the demands on our dwindling resources.

But from my perspective, it does not seem prudent to make sweeping and dramatic changes to either the funding or the mission of the United States Merchant Marine Academy. It's just too important. Let me put the importance of the merchant marine into perspective.

Think back to the days of Commander Decatur when America was a young and growing nation. American mer-

chant shipping vessels were being stopped in the Mediterranean and preyed upon by the Barbary Pirates, sailing from Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya. They attacked our merchant seamen, took hostages, and stole the ships and their cargo. The United States was so outraged, that we expanded our Navy several-fold to protect our merchant marine, because we recognized that America's future was forever tied to the free movement of American shipping on the high seas.

And today, after two centuries, our merchant marine is every bit as important and every bit as vital to the commerce and defense of our nation as it ever has been. In addition to America's commercial interests, which included the movement of more than 900 million long tons last year, the United States military depends on sealift to move 95 percent of the material required for a major regional contingency.

In DESERT STORM some 500 merchant mariners and 152 cadet midshipmen were called to duty to crew vessels that helped move 95 percent of the cargo required for our operations. And ask those here tonight from the Class of 1967 if the U.S. Merchant Marine is important to our operations.

These "Kings Pointers" were graduated six months early so that they could fill critical shortages in merchant marine billets on ships required to move material to Vietnam. We simply cannot overstate the vital contributions of our U.S. Merchant Marine. Our National Security Strategy depends on its vitality.

And to me the great success of our merchant marine is due in large measure to its dynamic and steadfast commitment to developing outstanding leaders. So tonight I thought I might share with you a word or two about leadership, a perspective gained over 39 years in uniform.

In a few months, when a number of you step aboard your first ship, you will look into the eyes of eighteen-year old seamen and the older more seasoned eyes of forty-year old chiefs. Because you wear an ensign's bar, they will follow your orders and do what you ask of them. By pinning on your rank we make you an officer, but that's all we do. Only the men and women under your command can make you a leader.

Now the true source of great strength in the sea services is not the money we spend on our equipment. It is not the fact that we have the fastest submarines or the most powerful ships. The real essence of our strength is the excellence of our people and the leadership abilities of those chosen to "take the helm."

I know that during your years here at Kings Point you have had the opportunity to read about many great leaders and debate their philosophies of leadership. It's very useful and you should continue to study the great captains. But it is also useful once in awhile to remember what Mark Twain said, "I have never let my schooling interfere with my education." That's so because sometimes the greatest lessons of leadership do not come from books but rather from observing those around you.

Over the years, watching many gifted leaders from Petty Officer to Admiral, from Sergeant to General, I've concluded that they all have three things in common: competence; caring; and character.

Competence — cornerstone of leadership; it is something you just cannot fake. It is also something that doesn't come automatically with an officer's braid. It's plain hard work. It's studying; it's practicing until you're confident that you know more than those whom you command. Leaders must know a great deal about their people, their profession, and their environment. Lack of knowledge is never an excuse for a leader's failure.

You all know this.

Think back to your semesters at sea with the crews of active vessels. What you saw was that every officer relied on the abilities of each seaman under his command. And what you also should have recognized was that the safe operation of the ship depended on each seaman trusting the professional abilities and judgment of the officers. The success of any civilian enterprise or military operation depends on the competence of a whole host of people up AND down the line. As Thucydides said in the 5th Century B.C., "A collision at sea can ruin your entire day."

But competence doesn't mean just being good at your job today.

Competence also means preparing yourself for tomorrow's challenges, looking ahead, and gaining an appreciation for the "big picture" and what is approaching from over-the-horizon. Yes, it takes hard work and an unquenchable thirst to know more, for a leader to earn the confidence of his crew. In a letter to Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee wrote, "No matter what may be the ability of the officer, if he loses the confidence of his troops disaster must sooner or later ensue." You must each continually improve your knowledge and your skills. You have a responsibility to become the master of your profession.

As you begin to get more comfortable in your jobs and more confident in your abilities, you will soon begin to understand the distinction between real leaders and people who are in leadership positions. Real leaders earn the willing trust of those they lead, because they believe the leader genuinely cares about them, their safety, and their future.

Admiral Hyman Rickover, the father of the nuclear Navy, demonstrated his concern for his sailors in a very unusual way. Most Americans don't know that Admiral Rickover went on the trial dive of every nuclear submarine the Navy

ever built. He knew it wasn't enough to just sign a piece of paper certifying to the vessel's safety. If sailors were going to trust their lives to an untested submarine he would go with them.

Caring for your subordinates also means challenging them, disciplining them fairly, and setting high standards. Our most demanding officers may well be the ones who care the most.

Enforcing high standards helps your sailors achieve their personal goals and gain their confidence. That confidence quickly translates into mission success.

But don't confuse high standards with harshness. Caring leaders are genuinely concerned for the welfare of their subordinates. Who is not moved by the recent story of the World War II officer who fought for 52 years to make sure that a black sergeant in his unit, killed in an act of heroism but denied the Medal of Honor because of racism, was given his just reward? I had the pleasure of recently attending the ceremony where Staff Sergeant Ruben Rivers posthumously received the Medal of Honor. This after 52 years of effort by his old Company Commander. That's caring. That's leadership.

Character or integrity, is the final trait and perhaps the most important.

You cannot be a leader unless you are a person of strong moral and ethical character. You must have a clear understanding of what is right and what is wrong. It was John Paul Jones who said, "It is by no means enough that an officer of the Navy should be a capable mariner. He must be that of course but also a great deal more. He should be as well a gentleman with the highest sense of personal honor."

Each of our Services have developed a set of common core values or moral standards upon which they base their service to the nation. The Navy and Marine Corps stress the values of honor, courage, and commitment. But for these values to take root they can't be imposed — they need to be assimilated over time into our daily habits. Values, after all, aren't taught — they're caught.

Character education is accomplished through the spirit and atmosphere of the unit and its codes of conduct. But most of all it is accomplished through its leaders and the quality of their example. What sort of ethical signals do we give when we prepare our units for inspection exercises and missions? How do we handle bad news from subordinates? Are we fair in the treatment of subordinates?

I am of the view that there is nothing you will do as a leader that will not in some way or another contribute to the ethical foundation of your unit. There is an old saying that people listen to 10 percent of what you say but watch 100 percent of what you do. Your words and actions must fit together and they must be beyond reproach. I can't say this strongly enough.

The first time you give your crew reason to doubt your integrity you will have lost them. The people in your charge must be able to have complete faith in everything you say and in everything that you do. It is just that simple.

I can best convey that thought by using the words of that World War II British Field Marshal Bernard Law Montgomery. "The first thing a young officer must do," Monty said, "is to fight a battle and that battle is for the hearts of his men. If he wins that battle his men will follow him anywhere. If he loses he will never do any real good."

The reality is that there are hundreds of great leaders out there with every bit as much character, caring, and competence as Admiral Rickover and John Paul Jones. Your challenge is to seek out these great leaders and learn their great lessons.

But I will also offer a caution.

Don't just busy yourself trying to discover what made these Generals or Admirals great. Try to discover as well what makes a great Ensign. Because in a few short months when you pin on your gold bars, no one is going to ask you to breathe life back into a nation, command a fleet, or restructure the Merchant Marine. Instead some of you will be asked to assume responsibilities of an Ensign, for leading America's sons and daughters, guiding them, teaching them, caring for each of them, and ensuring their welfare.

The future of our armed forces and the merchant marine depends on your ability to fulfill those tasks. And the true judges of your success in this endeavor will be those very men and women whom our nation has entrusted to your care. Your motto, "Deeds not Words," is an excellent beacon for the challenges ahead. Let it be the lighthouse of your soul.

After 39 years of service in the Army, I wish I could change places with you because I am sure that you will find that your graduation will mark the start of the greatest adventure of your life. If there is something that I wish I could pass on to you this evening, it would be my sense of excitement at the opportunities I know await you all as our nation prepares to begin the 21st Century.

What you will be asked to do will be difficult as challenging as you can imagine and as exciting as you could possibly hope for. But also understand that everything that will be asked of you in the service to our nation will require every ounce of your energy every bit of your experience and every scrap of your courage.

No one understood this better than the 142 Kings Point graduates whose names are forever etched on the Role of Honor in the Mariner's Chapel and whose memory we honor tonight.

I wish you all the best of luck and salute your dedication to this great nation.

Joint Force Quarterly Magazine
"A Word from the Chairman"
Winter 1996-1997

Since I last addressed *Joint Vision 2010* in these pages (*JFQ*, Summer 1996), it has stimulated much discussion and healthy debate. I am particularly heartened by the spirited professional dialogue which is helping us achieve a better understanding of service and joint capabilities, now and into the future. This edition of *Joint Force Quarterly*, which focuses on doctrine, enlarges that debate and provides us an opportunity to reexamine *JV 2010*'s basic precepts, as well as its implementation.

I would like to offer my perspective on a few of the issues which have emerged from these discussions. First, *JV 2010*'s key operational concepts are not limited to mid- or high-intensity conflict. They apply across the full range of military operations, from peacekeeping to war at the highest levels of intensity. "Full spectrum dominance" — from the high end to the low — is essential if we are to remain the world's dominant fighting force. Second, no Service or Unified Command should think of itself primarily in terms of any one of the key operational concepts. The operational concepts in *JV 2010* require the synergistic effects of all services at all levels. Third, technological advancements are key to *JV 2010*'s operational concepts, but they must share center stage with our dedicated, high quality people.

Full Spectrum Dominance

Two years ago, when we began developing *JV 2010*, our discussions centered on the premise that technological change could dramatically alter the conduct of war. That point was made in many sources, including the 1994 Joint Strategy Review (JSR). I have just approved and released the 1996 version of this classified report.

JSR 96, which provides an updated analysis of the trends that are shaping our likely future strategic environment, posits that out to 2010 the United States will continue to face dangerous opposition from more than one regional power. Our forces will face a range of threats: from terrorists, to rogue states with weapons of mass destruction, to potent regional powers. And out beyond 2010, we may even have to worry about emerging peer competitors or new global powers. In all, the future security environment will be at least as challenging in the future as it is today. And, it will continue to be as important to prevent and deter conflict, as it is to be ready to fight and win our Nation's wars.

JV 2010 complements JSR 96. While the JSR describes the likely future strategic environment, *Joint Vision 2010* describes the key operational concepts: *dominant maneuver*, *precision engagement*, *full-dimensional protection*, and *focused logistics*. These concepts will enable joint forces in the future to successfully accomplish any mission that the strategic environment presents. The future operational concepts posited in *JV 2010* are applicable across the spectrum of operations which the JSR describes.

Bosnia is both a good example of these emerging concepts and a good illustration of how capabilities for one strategic need can be adapted to meet another. We deployed a force which was prepared to execute its high intensity wartime tasks. And it is our conventional combat power which became, and remains, the backbone of our peacekeeping efforts there. The Implementation Force controlled the situation there because widely dispersed units controlled the battlespace, including key terrain, airspace, and the surrounding waters. This is a good example of the emerging concept of dominant maneuver.

Empowered by information superiority, forces were positioned in a manner which enabled them to respond rapidly to real-time crises anywhere in the area of operations. Clearly, our robust intelligence system, with advanced systems such as Predator and the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), ensured a high level of shared situational awareness and early warning to operational and tactical commanders.

Similarly, the emerging concept of precision engagement was evident in Bosnia. Commanders were able to employ the right force to achieve the necessary effect. Whether they threatened the use of high technology weapons systems, or applied non-lethal capabilities such as military police, civil affairs and psychological operations units, the desired effect was the same: they convinced the opposing factions to end the violence or risk decisive defeat.

Overall in Bosnia, unified joint forces achieved full spectrum dominance by massing effects from widely dispersed

elements of all services. Furthermore, despite the fact that our forces were originally trained and equipped to conduct large scale combat operations, their skilled leaders and highly trained men and women displayed great agility by rapidly adjusting training, organization, and tactics to meet the demands of the environment. They performed magnificently, showing clearly that *JV 2010's* key operational concepts will be applicable to future conflict at the lower end of the spectrum.

Our tremendous success in Bosnia is in large part a result of our agility, a product of quality people, superb leadership, and tough mission-oriented training. As we take further advantage of emerging technologies, especially information technologies, we will greatly enhance our agility, simultaneously improving our ability to fight as a coherent joint force, while rapidly adapting our capabilities for use across the full spectrum of operations.

Our success in Bosnia is also in large measure a result of our close cooperation with our international partners. More so than ever, we must continue to place a high priority on our ability to function as a member of a coalition force. Just as we have witnessed in Bosnia, future crises will be best countered by a response from all nations who have a stake in the outcome. The effectiveness of any future combined force will be a direct reflection of the seamless integration of its national components.

As we have clarified our understanding of full spectrum dominance, we have also gained insights into the nature of force development in our rapidly changing world. We cannot have a force structure oriented on a single threat or a single level of operational intensity. Today, our force structure must be capabilities-based, and those capabilities must be focused on achieving the over-arching operational concepts in *JV 2010*.

The Services, The CINCs, and The Operational Concepts

All of the key operational concepts are the province of each of the Services. They are concepts that our joint forces must achieve together by empowering our people and managing change wisely. *Joint Vision 2010* builds on the core competencies, institutional values, and cultures of our Services, while recognizing that each Service has unique capabilities for which there are no substitutes. It links the Services as elements of a unified joint team through the shared situational awareness and common communications of information superiority and these common operational concepts. By accomplishing that, the Unified Commanders will be able to employ forces using these new concepts.

The evolution of joint doctrine illustrates one example of the requirement to integrate service efforts to produce viable joint capabilities. In the past, joint doctrine was based on existing Service doctrine. It integrated existing doctrine to meet specific joint warfighting requirements. However, Service doctrine did not always address the full complexity of joint operations, and it left the Services and Unified Commands to develop ad hoc solutions where gaps in doctrine existed.

Over the past several years, we have made great strides in providing our warfighters with significantly improved joint doctrine. That has been accomplished only as a result of the hard work and close coordination of all the services, the combatant commands, and the Joint Staff. With the development of *Joint Vision 2010*, we have spelled out the basic capabilities required of our future joint force, providing the conceptual template to guide future joint doctrine development. At the same time, *JV 2010* will allow each Service to focus more closely on its contributions to joint doctrine.

In the coming months, the Services, CINCs, Defense agencies, and other experts, working in close collaboration with the Joint Warfighting Center, will continue to refine the *Concept for Future Joint Operations (CFJO)*. This important document amplifies the four operational concepts and provides the initial basis for a variety of assessment activities. It is the next, logical step in transforming key *JV 2010* ideas into actual joint force capabilities.

The CFJO is the first *JV 2010* implementation concept document and it will provide a means by which the Services, the Unified Commands, and the Joint Staff can debate and assess the nature of future joint operations across the full spectrum of operations. Our continued progress in the effective implementation of *JV 2010* depends on an understanding that the *JV 2010* concepts apply to all Services and how they operate together as a joint team.

Advanced Technology and the Role of People

JV 2010 emphasizes the critical importance of information superiority and other technological innovations. Together, they offer the potential to lessen the impact of the fog of war by giving us an advantage in gathering, exploiting, and protecting information. They also enable us to derive the most combat power from our available manpower, offsetting a potential adversary's advantages in mass, proximity, niche technologies, or weapons of mass destruction.

However, our commitment to advanced warfighting is neither a substitute for quality people nor a technical pana-

cea for future military challenges. Future technological advances will not make war less arduous or dangerous, nor will they make most missions less demanding on our people. In 2010, as in 1997, the human element will remain the most critical ingredient of operational success.

The scope and breadth of operations in the future will require decision makers at all levels, from headquarters to the smallest of units, who can respond more rapidly and accurately to operational demands than ever before. While decision-making processes and operational capabilities will be supported by advances in technology, success will ultimately be determined by the quality of our people, their training, and their leaders.

It is not a question of people *or* technology, but rather a question of how the strengths of both are integrated to give this Nation the best possible military capability. As the implementation of *JV 2010* moves forward, it will have to address both how quality people can best use modern technology and how technology can be leveraged to improve training and education, those things that make good people better.

JV 2010 aptly describes the vital role of people:

We cannot expect risk-free, push-button style operations in the future. Military operations will continue to demand extraordinary dedication and sacrifice under the most adverse conditions. Some military operations will require close combat on the ground, at sea, or in the air. The courage and heart of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines will remain the foundation of all that our Armed Forces must do.

In all, *Joint Vision 2010* is not so much a document, as it is a living body of ideas about joint warfare, and a deliberate, iterative process of evolutionary change that will help the Services and Unified Commands march into the future together. In the world of 2010, to successfully accomplish a wide range of missions, we must achieve an effective, balanced integration of our Services' core competencies. By working together as a joint team, *JV 2010* will help us do that. Today and into the future, our Armed Forces must remain "persuasive in peace, decisive in war, and preeminent in any form of conflict."

**Salute to the Military Ball
Coronado, California
15 March 1997**

Thank you Coronado for your warm welcome to this beautiful city and to this historic hotel and to your celebration of "Stars and Stripes and Songs." Joannie and I appreciate your small-town hospitality as well as your big-city class.

And thanks as well to that sharp color guard, the superb band, and those wonderful singers. Please join me in a well-deserved round of applause for these fine young Americans.

Before I begin let me offer a sincere "Happy Birthday" to tonight's sponsor, the Chamber of Commerce, as they celebrate their 60th birthday this year. I can tell you from first-hand experience, a 60th birthday is a scary thing. My cake looked like an eerie torch light procession. The heat was so intense it almost set the sprinklers off. And to help me blow out the candles and launch into another year I had to do what aircraft carriers do, that is, turn into the wind. But seriously, I wish the Chamber many, many years of continued support to this grand community. So would you please join me in a round of applause for the Chamber of Commerce and for everyone who worked so hard to make this celebration so special.

It's great to be here among so many old friends, especially so many old Navy friends. I have often wondered where Navy admirals go when they retire. Now I know.

And one of the Army guys on my staff must have known that because he asked me if I was worried about going to an island which is inhabited by so many "navalists!" I told him I wouldn't be alone, Bruce Williams and George Styer are holding down the fort for me here. And besides, Coronado has a great reputation for protecting endangered species, especially when their days as Chairman are numbered.

But I must say I have always enjoyed the Navy's camaraderie, especially at celebrations such as this. As we celebrate together, let me offer you a few of my thoughts about this wonderful land of ours and about our nation's treasure, our men and women in uniform.

Our nation's might, I suggest to you, is a reflection of our national character, our great people in uniform, and the caring communities that nurture them. When Francis Scott Key was asked what inspired him to write the words to the "Star Spangled Banner," he said, "Does not such a country with such brave defenders deserve such a song?"

It was September 13, 1814, and every American's heart was filled with outrage; outrage at the burning of America's capital just days before. But despite the gloomy prospects, thousands had rushed from all over the region to defend the port of Baltimore, which now was the one hope left of tilting the war in America's favor.

The next day, after 25 hours of bloody bombardment, the stormy darkness gave way to a clear star-lit dawn over Fort McHenry. There, framed by the heavens, our flag — the Stars and Stripes — gave proof that the American ideal was the lasting heart and soul of a proud nation.

It's easy to imagine how Francis Scott Key felt as he witnessed the raw courage, the selfless sacrifice, and the unwavering commitment of the men and women who risked all for God and country. But I submit to you the history of our Stars and Stripes and the history of our nation is a living story a story of evolution, not just a story of a creation.

We have withstood challenge after challenge. And with each challenge our flag has steadily grown in stature throughout the world, quietly rendering living testimony to America's past, its present, and its future, and bearing witness to our history of sacrifice, selfless service, and undiminished hope. And today, our patriots in uniform are still standing watch and still providing the courage and sacrifices which inspire us all as well as people all over the globe.

Year after year, in the most remote corners of the world you will find the Stars and Stripes and America's Armed Forces, performing absolutely magnificently and sacrificing their personal interests to protect our national interests and bring hope to those less fortunate. And so often on the tip of our nation's arrow are the naval services.

George Washington once said, "Without a decisive naval force we can do nothing definitive and with it everything great and glorious." You know that he was right.

The battles are forever etched in our memories: places like Coral Sea; Midway; the Philippines Sea; Inchon; Yankee Station; and the Persian Gulf. Uncommon valor in Nimitz's words was a common virtue.

It's true the Navy and the Marine Corps have been the vanguard of our nation's hopes and dreams. And today, rarely noticed in the news, you will see sailors and marines, shoulder to shoulder with soldiers, airmen, and coastguardsmen, serving all around the globe with distinction, asking for little and doing what Americans have simply come to expect of them; being skilled professionals taking care of America's interests — whether guarding the DMZ in Korea, patrolling the skies in Iraq, keeping war from re-igniting in Bosnia, or even tonight, rescuing our citizens from the chaos in Albania.

Tonight, as we celebrate in this impressive hall, 42,000 magnificent men and women are participating in 13 separate actual operations around the world. And few across America will take note when in less than three weeks the CONSTELLATION deploys from Coronado for six months to replace the KITTY HAWK in the Persian Gulf. And whatever challenges arise for them here, at home, or at sea, nothing will stop them from accomplishing their mission or caring for each other. To the crew of the CONSTELLATION I wish fair winds and following seas and to the crew of the KITTY HAWK, I say BRAVO ZULU, well done!

But the sailing of CONSTELLATION is just one deployment of the countless we have witnessed in recent years.

We are busier today than we were during most of the Cold War. As a matter of fact, I asked one lieutenant where home was and he said, "Home is wherever I am between deployments."

But I see our men and women willingly sacrifice time with their families, the comforts of home, and sometimes even sacrifice their lives. And they make those sacrifices because they know they have your support and that you, the people of Coronado and others like you across this land, will sacrifice for them were that ever necessary.

During World War II, I am told your city became known as the "BOQ" because you poured out your hearts and everything you had to support our service men and women. And today, just as in World War II, Coronado is the "anchor for our forces afloat in the Pacific."

Coronado's legacy is a legacy of community support, selfless service, and heroic figures who thought of themselves as ordinary people. People like George Cooksey and Morey Wax whom you honored tonight. Both of them were great patriots who influenced more lives than we will ever know. Their loss will be long felt by Coronado and by those they touched.

People like Admiral Jim Stockdale, who earned our nation's highest decoration for valor, the Medal of Honor.

People like Admiral Harry T. Jenkins, whose sacrifices and contributions set high standards for the awards you presented earlier.

Because of the sacrifices of people like these and of all of our men and women in uniform, and the unwavering support from communities like Coronado, we have maintained our leadership around the globe.

And tomorrow, the world will look to America as it has in the past, as a beacon of hope and as an island of strength and decency. One hundred and eighty-three years after Fort McHenry, the American qualities which inspired Francis Scott Key remain the bedrock of hope for the world. And so it is in the Pacific region, our commitments and our

presence will remain vital to our future, for we are by any measure a mighty Pacific nation. And our neighbors in the Pacific, with their diverse cultures, booming economies, and fledgling democracies each look to America for peace, for presence, and for prosperity.

America's future is inextricably linked with that of our Pacific neighbors. And our Navy and the people of Coronado will play a key role in our policy toward Asia and the Pacific! And by the way, I was very happy to hear that later this month, and for the first time in history, three Chinese military ships will conduct a visit to Coronado.

So tonight as we salute the millions of American service men and women who have contributed so selflessly to the living legacy of our Stars and Stripes, we also pay tribute to the unwavering commitment of the caring communities like Coronado who support them.

Even when the very existence of our nation was threatened as it was at Fort McHenry, or when our nation was torn by a devastating Civil War, the thoughts and the actions of every American were anchored in a singleness of purpose: "... to preserve one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

So tonight's celebration is a celebration of the extraordinary achievements of our nation, her people, her armed forces, and her communities and of the hope of a brighter future for us and for our children. We, you, me, the people of Coronado, the Navy, and all of the services remain dedicated to the ideals which are so simply yet so profoundly alive in our Stars and Stripes and in the spirit of our songs. And on that thought let me end.

Before dinner I asked Chuck, "How long should I speak?" He said, "Take as long as you like but we start dancing at exactly 9:40." And I knew you would rather resume dancing than listen.

So thank you for all that you have done, and for this grand evening and may God Bless you and may God Bless the United States of America.

**PLA National Defense University
Beijing, China
14 May 1997**

I am delighted to be in China and honored to be here at your National Defense University. Being here this morning brings to mind my visit to China ten years ago in the company of the then-Army Chief of Staff, General John Wickham, Jr. We were very impressed then, but I must tell you that the effects of your rapid economic growth and the massive amounts of construction in China are breathtaking, but not quite as breathtaking as the change in our political relations.

It has been twenty-five years now since President Nixon journeyed to China, where he and Premier Zhou Enlai approved the Shanghai Communiqué, breaking a quarter century of hostility and misunderstanding and laying the foundation for a more fruitful bilateral relationship. Later on, both of our countries came to owe a special debt of gratitude to the late Deng Xiaoping, whose pragmatism and vision provided the foundation for the rapid economic development of China as well as the rapid expansion of cooperation between our two countries.

Today, one statistic speaks volumes about the level of our interaction. Today, there are more than 40,000 Chinese students in American universities and schools. Who would have imagined that 25 years ago? But now, following diplomatic gains, student exchanges, and our many business ventures, our two nations are pursuing military-to-military ties to improve communications, reduce potential misunderstandings, and carry out mutually beneficial activities. Some of these military to military contacts will be symbolically important, but relatively simple affairs, like the visit of two Chinese destroyers and an oiler to Pearl Harbor and to San Diego California in March of this year. By the way, I am happy to report that while the U.S. won in basketball, we played soccer to a hard-fought tie. But I have to tell you our naval commanders were worried that they might have to face a Chinese team in gymnastics or ping-pong!

But at the same time there are aspects of our military-to-military ties that are more substantive. As you know, then-Defense Secretary William Perry visited China in 1994 and General Chi visited the United States last December and spoke at our National Defense University. While he was there, General Chi neatly summarized why he came to America and indeed why I am here today. General Chi said, "... so long as we make concerted efforts in the spirit of equality and consultation, our military-to-military ties will continue to move forward and give positive impetus to the improvement and growth of relations between two countries."

So with improving our military to military contacts in mind, I would like to discuss with you United States National Security policy, how our Armed Forces are organized to protect our interests, and the importance of the Asia-Pacific region, where as General Chi noted, both the United States and China are "major powers."

To begin, U.S. Security Strategy, the strategy that guides our diplomatic, economic, and defense policy, has changed

considerably since 1989. With the end of the Cold War and a significant decline in the threat from the former Soviet Union, we have developed a new National Security Strategy. Our new strategy is called the Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement; engagement with old friends and old adversaries alike, and enlargement, which refers to enlarging the community of free-market democracies, a truly global phenomenon.

The goals of our strategy are to enhance our security with effective diplomatic representation abroad; deter war, but should deterrence fail, to be ready with military forces that are prepared to fight and win; bolster America's economic revitalization primarily by means of free and open trade; and promote democracy abroad.

Our new national strategy and a declining threat have enabled us to cut our military personnel by one-third; that's a reduction of 700,000 high quality volunteers, the soul of our Armed Forces and the real source of our military power. Today, worldwide, the United States has less than 1.5 million people in its active forces. In terms of combat formations, we have reduced Army divisions and Air Force wings by 45 percent and Navy ships by 38 percent. Our defense budget has been reduced by 40 percent over its high point in the Cold War. And as some of you may know, we will soon announce the results of a major defense review, one that most likely will result in further modest cuts to our Armed Forces.

In the interest of transparency, I have asked the staff here to distribute some charts which show the current location and status of all of our forces worldwide. These charts are from the detailed "Department of Defense Annual Report," a few copies of which I will give your Commandant for your library. I will also leave behind a series of publications that detail the characteristics of nearly every major American weapons system as well as other pieces of equipment. But data on our force structure doesn't tell the whole story of the U.S. Armed Forces after the Cold War.

In America, many observers noted with some irony that the Cold War was followed by a hot peace! After the Cold War we found ourselves faced with some new regional aggressors like Iraq, as well as some old ones like North Korea. Those were the greatest and most immediate threats to our interests. But after the Cold War we also found a world adrift in a sea of instability with disintegrating states, ethnic conflicts, the threat of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and the rise of sophisticated terrorist movements.

To protect our interests, U.S. forces, together with those of our friends and allies, have had to carry out a number of operations around the world in such places as Bosnia, Haiti, and the Middle East. Most of these operations have been peacekeeping operations, humanitarian assistance, or operations to evacuate civilians, including on several occasions, Chinese citizens from war-torn areas. Interestingly, none of our major operations have taken place in the Asia-Pacific region, which compared to Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, is an island of relative stability.

As you might suspect as the environment evolved and our appreciation for this "new world" evolved, so has our defense strategy. We abandoned the Cold War strategy of containment and the bilateral competition of the Cold War. While we cut back our forces, we re-oriented them on the need to respond to two nearly simultaneous major military contingencies such as we might face with Iraq or possibly North Korea. But over time, this "two major conflict" posture, as important as it was, failed to adequately describe the whole set of requirements that faced our Armed Forces.

As we struggled to build a strategy to guide our forces into the twenty-first century, we came to see our key tasks in a new light. For the future our Armed Forces worldwide will focus on three tasks.

First, we will seek to shape the strategic environment, hoping to prevent the conditions that cause war or at the very least deter war from breaking out. Along with diplomacy and trade, our forces can shape a more peaceful and stable environment by forward presence, security assistance to our friends and allies, and military-to-military contacts, which promote communications and help to reduce misunderstanding. But our attempts to shape the environment and to prevent conflict will not succeed everywhere all the time.

As a second major task, we believe that when deterrence fails we must be ready to respond across the full spectrum of crises when it is in our interest to do so. While we remain prepared for multiple major contingencies, we recognize that the most likely form of conflict that we will face will be smaller-scale contingency operations. Included in these operations are humanitarian assistance, non-combatant evacuations as we recently did in Albania, or limited strikes or interventions. Whatever the level of the intensity of the combat, we believe that we must also prepare for asymmetric threats such as terrorism, the use of chemical or biological weapons by an adversary, and even attacks on our information infrastructure abroad or in the United States.

As a final task, we believe that the U.S. Armed Forces must prepare now with a prudent modernization program to meet the challenges of an uncertain future, one that promises to be as challenging as today's environment. I tell my staff that modernization spending today is the foundation of readiness tomorrow. After a decade of limited investment the United States Armed Forces must have an investment program that unites our efforts to replace old and aging equipment

and adapt to the Revolution in Military Affairs with efficient acquisition and management techniques. In the next decade, our nation will probably not spend more on defense than we do at present.

To afford modernization, we will have to work harder and work smarter. And part of improving our forces in the future will come from harmonizing the force development efforts of all of our services and our unified commands. A year ago we published *Joint Vision 2010*, based on new operational concepts which will guide the development of our Armed Forces for the next 15 years. Everything — doctrine, training, senior officer education, requirements, procurement — all of these things hopefully will be influenced by *Joint Vision 2010* and its implementation documents. Again, in the interests of transparency I will leave copies of this document with your President.

So that is the essence of our new defense strategy: shape a peaceful and stable environment; respond to crises and conflicts as necessary; and prepare for the future with a balanced, sensible, coordinated, modernization program. How does all of this apply to our policies in the Asia-Pacific region?

Today in the Asia-Pacific region, the United States has vital security and economic interests, some of which have roots that are more than a century old. Because of its geography and its interests, the United States is and will remain a major power in the Asia-Pacific region.

First, geographically we are a Pacific nation just as China is a Pacific nation. The Pacific Ocean washes the coast of the continental United States and the states of Alaska and Hawaii. When I go home to the state of Washington on the west coast of the United States, I awake each day to the sounds of the Pacific Ocean. And the state of Hawaii and our territories extend thousands of miles into the Pacific. But we realize that we are not alone in the Asia-Pacific region. We realize that this vast region is an area where four great powers have overlapping interests. In this century, we have fought three wars in this region. And in the next century, we do not wish to repeat that.

Second, we have major allies and friends like Japan, the Republic of Korea, Australia, Thailand, and the Philippines, who also want our presence in the region as a force for peace and stability. In keeping with that, the United States ashore and afloat maintains about 100,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in the Asia-Pacific region. Indeed, among our friends and allies there is some misplaced anxiety that we may soon reduce our military presence in the region. On that issue, let me repeat what Secretary of Defense Cohen recently said. We have no plans to reduce our troop presence in the Asia-Pacific region. To reduce our troop presence could destabilize the region and could set off a heated arms race in the area. And thus we think the whole region, including China, benefits from our presence. But having allies presupposes that they see a common threat.

It is fair to ask what specific threats do the United States and our friends and allies see in the Asia-Pacific region? First and most threatening is the unpredictable regime in Pyongyang, which poses a major threat to peace on the Korean peninsula and in the surrounding area. This threat is magnified by the regime's current economic problems and its apparent inability to feed its population. This is a sad situation. Today, the security situation on the Korean peninsula is worse than it was 25 years ago when I served there as a military planner. Let me add that we continue to welcome China's active participation in the four power talks and its bilateral efforts to help reduce tensions on the Korean peninsula, and we appreciate China's efforts to help us keep nuclear weapons off of the Korean peninsula.

Other threats in the region may come in the form of nuclear, chemical, and missile technology proliferation, both in the region and coming from the region. We are in that light, very concerned about arms transfers by China to Pakistan and to Iran. In the region, there are also some significant territorial disputes concerning Japan's Northern Territories as well as islands in the South China Sea. And finally, drug trafficking and the ever-present potential for terrorism are both cause for concern. In addition to these specific well-known threats to peace and stability there are also uncertainties that concern every nation in the region.

Among these uncertainties is what will happen this summer with the return of Hong Kong to Chinese sovereignty. As the clock in Tienamen Square counts down the hours, we hope that the reversion of this vibrant city to Chinese control takes place peacefully and with respect for the welfare and the human rights of the people involved.

On the issue of Taiwan, the United States remains committed to our policy of One China as defined in the three communiqués and the Taiwan Relations Act, the U.S. law on this issue. Again, we hope for the resolution of the issue, which is clearly a matter for the Chinese people on both sides of the Taiwan Straits to resolve in a peaceful manner. But we are all also concerned with the peace and stability of the region and in the surrounding international waters.

I would be remiss if I did not add here that last March, we were concerned by the harsh rhetoric and some of the military actions in that area that may have had unpredictable consequences. We are pleased that this situation is beginning to move onto the more constructive path of rational dialogue. We hope, as I am sure you do, that future developments concerning Taiwan will take place peacefully with full respect for the welfare and human rights of the people involved as well as for freedom of navigation in the area.

A final reason why the United States will remain a major power in the Asia-Pacific region is that the U.S., like China, is a trading nation with one-third of our annual product tied to our exports and our imports. The Asia-Pacific region is not only the engine of world economic growth, but it is also home to five of America's "top ten" trading partners: Japan; China; Taiwan; South Korea; and Singapore. U.S. trade with East Asia alone surpasses 400 billion dollars annually, accounting for more than 3 million American jobs and 40 percent of our total trade. Thus for both economic and security reasons, we in the United States believe that peace prosperity and stability in the Asia-Pacific region are vital to our interests. And we know that to a large extent you share many of those same interests.

China is a Great Power and it is rapidly becoming a Greater Power. And believe me, we see your development as being in our interest. I am told that there are some here in China who believe that the United States seeks to contain China. Nothing could be further from the truth. Containment would have to include severe political, economic, and military policies, none of which are in evidence in our policy toward China. Our interests can only be served in the words of Secretary of State Madeline Albright, "by a China that is neither threatening nor threatened."

In the information age, at the dawn of the 21st century, our security and prosperity and your security and prosperity are inextricably linked. President Clinton said that we are anxious to see a China that is "stable politically and open economically, that respects human rights and the rule of law, and that becomes a full partner in building a secure international order." The mutual interests of China and the United States demand better understanding, clearer communications, greater confidence, and deeper cooperation. And military-to-military contacts must be an essential part of all that.

But these military-to-military contacts must not remain limited to occasional meetings between senior officers or routine troop or ship visits. To be a fruitful form of engagement, our military-to-military contacts must deepen and become more frequent more balanced and more developed. Our mutual goals are easy to understand. We, as two of the great powers in the Asia-Pacific region, both seek to decrease suspicion, further mutually beneficial military cooperation, and lessen the chances for miscalculation in a crisis. For our part, to accomplish these objectives, the United States wants a more equal exchange of information with the PLA; the development of confidence building measures to reduce further the possibility of miscalculations; military, academic, and functional exchanges; PLA participation in multinational military activities; and a regular dialogue between our senior military leaderships. We want these things for our own interests and we are sure that China has a similar list.

Let's compare our lists! Two items that should be on both of our lists are the agreement on Hong Kong port calls now well along in its development and the completion of the Military Maritime and Air Cooperation Agreement. This latter agreement will improve our protocols for communication at sea and in the air. And this agreement will create common expectations and lessen the possibility of miscalculation throughout the vast Pacific Ocean area. But we should not fool ourselves. Improving our military-to-military contacts will not be easy. And in order to earn big dividends we must make a big investment.

If we listen to the suspicious side of our military minds, if we don't pursue exchanges on a fair and equitable basis, if we lack openness, transparency, or reciprocity, if we hold back even routine information on our military forces, then we will fail. To succeed, we will have overcome our past and struggle up-hill against our suspicions to reach the point where together we can with greater confidence see a better future. But if we make that climb, if we get to the top, we will know the truth of the words spoken by Zhou Enlai to President Nixon. "... on perilous peaks dwells beauty in its infinite variety."

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for your attention. I am ready for your questions.

**Harvey Mudd College
Commencement Address
Claremont, California
18 May 1997**

President Strauss, distinguished guests, parents, families and friends, faculty and staff, and graduating students of Harvey Mudd. It is a great pleasure for me to be with you on this very special day for the class of 1997.

I am here not only as a senior military officer and as an engineer, but most personally, as the uncle of a member of the graduating class.

My niece finally confessed to me this morning ... that I was not really your first choice for commencement speaker, but she hoped, nevertheless, that I would be a suitable replacement for Bill Nye the Science Guy!

Now for you graduates, this is one of the pivotal events of your lives and I know I speak for everyone here in saying how very proud we are of what you have each accomplished.

Since its founding in 1955 Harvey Mudd has been one of our nation's most prestigious and demanding schools for science, math, and engineering. Your successful completion of Harvey Mudd's challenging curriculum, shows that you all possess the ability, the drive, and the determination required of our most successful leaders in the field of science and technology. You have finally pulled your final set of "all nighters," finally crossed all the rivers, climbed all the mountains, and slain all the dragons which a few years ago stood between you and a diploma.

I would particularly like to add my congratulations to all those computer scientists here today that earned Harvey Mudd the title of "Computing World Champion" in the 21st world championship, sponsored by the Association for Computing. As for me, I can't wait until the year 2000 ... when millions of computers will think zero zero, stands for the year 1900. For one shining moment, computers will be dumber than the rest of us!

Over the past four years it has been my pleasure to experience vicariously, through my niece, Liz Thompson, what it is like to be a MUDDER. I've heard about your preferred modes of transportation ... unicycles and skateboards ... reveled in the engineering competitions ... and laughed at the South Dorm jokes. I even shared Evan Goer's nightmare, duly recorded on Wendy Panero's door: "What would you do if we woke up tomorrow and discovered this was all a dream ... and you were all still freshmen?"

Well, somebody pinch Evan; this really is graduation day!

On the way over to today's ceremony I was reflecting on just how much our two generations have in common. I often see harsh criticism of our young people in the media and it brings back old memories.

You see, in the late 50s, our parents also questioned our morals, manners, and our music. But in the end it didn't matter, because we were proven right. Elvis Presley really was the King!

So I tend to discount much of what I hear about your generation because every day, I have the wonderful experience of watching thousands of young men and women of your generation, performing superbly on the most difficult missions around the globe. From Albania to Zaire, from Iraq to Korea, members of "generation X" are protecting the oppressed, providing new hope for troubled nations, and guarding the freedoms of Americans around the globe, wherever they might be. We wouldn't have the world's best and most powerful military without their dedication and outstanding professionalism.

To me, your generation is the single greatest source of my boundless optimism for the future and you, this class, from this college, will surely lead the way.

But on this day, in which we rightfully celebrate the achievements of the graduating class, we must also praise your parents.

Parents, where would we be without you? You provided encouragement when challenges arose, comfort when times were tough, nagging when nagging was called for, and prayer whenever it was needed.

Today is your day too.

Please join me in a round of applause ... for your terrific parents.

Thirty-nine years ago I also sat in an audience like this, a brand new engineering graduate of Bradley University. And as I think back and try to remember what was said at my graduation, I can't remember a single word nor even a thought from my commencement speaker. In fact, I can't even remember who he was. I remember only that he commenced and we eagerly awaited his finish. So I must be brief and race to the finish, but not before I say a word or two about your future.

Right now, some of you are feeling a real sense of accomplishment, others are feeling an equally satisfying sense of relief, and some of you may even be a bit uncertain about what lies ahead. That is only natural.

I am a good bit older and I must confess that I begin each day with much the same feelings: remembering good things from the past; relieved to have survived some of the more difficult challenges; and wondering what's coming next.

But I want to assure you that you are graduating at a time and into a world filled with greater hope and with more opportunities than any generation this century.

When I was your age the moon was little more than an inspiration to poets and to sweethearts and Popular Mechanics Magazine predicted that, "Computers in the future may one day weigh only one and one half tons."

By the time you are my age, the moon will be just another airport and computers, well, I have given up making bold predictions since they have already emerged as world champion chess players.

Today, you are on the threshold of opportunities that did not exist in my day, opportunities that you cannot even

imagine. But as you enter this "Brave New World," you will most certainly discover that opportunity rarely "knocks on your door" as the old saying suggested and if it does, it usually knocks so softly that you had better be listening closely.

Rather, your success will be determined by your ability to make your own opportunities by exploring new territory, tearing down old paradigms, and challenging the status quo. As John Rockefeller once said, "If you want to succeed you should strike out on new paths rather than travel on the worn paths of accepted success."

But I think Yogi Berra said it even better, "Don't always follow the crowd," he observed. "Nobody goes there anymore ... It's too crowded!"

So don't wait for opportunity to knock on your door, go out and meet it. But to go out the door and meet opportunity head-on, you'll need every ounce of courage you can muster. I'm not talking so much about physical courage. I am talking about having the courage to take chances and make mistakes, having the courage to believe in yourself, and having the courage to adapt and change when circumstances warrant.

Many years ago on an old television show, I remember Archie Bunker saying, "God don't make mistakes ... that's how he got to be God." But innovators do make mistakes, lots of them. That's how they learn.

Did you know that Thomas Edison once conducted 50,000 experiments trying to develop a new storage battery? Asked if it was frustrating to have so many failures, Edison answered, "What failures? I now know 50,000 things that don't work."

Sitting among you in this graduating class might be the next Edison, Buckminster Fuller, or Bill Gates. But it will take courage and confidence in your abilities to stay the course.

But having the courage to pursue make your own opportunities is not enough. I am convinced that you cannot be a great scientist, mathematician, or soldier for that matter ... unless you possess a strong ethical character.

We can debate the constituent part of character for hours, but clearly the core element of character is integrity; knowing what is right and then acting on it. While easier said than done, you must know what's right and then always, always do the right thing.

Benjamin Franklin hit the nail on the head when he said, "It is a grand mistake to think of being great ... without goodness."

In a similar vein, science has a special place in society and scientists and engineers have long known that the way to serve yourself is to serve others. This notion has been part and parcel of your education at Harvey Mudd and it is the reason why your alma mater requires more humanities courses than any other institution of science and technology in the United States.

Every educated person, and especially scientists and engineers, have a responsibility to see our world as it really is, imagine it as it ought to be, and then work to bridge the chasm between the two. If you adopt that ethic, you will become in Einstein's words, not just "... a person of success," but also "... a person of value."

In a speech at Harvard in 1943, Winston Churchill predicted that, "The empires of the future ... are the empires of the mind."

Today, more than ever before, the quality and character of our thinking is what separates success from failure, and excellence from mediocrity. The treasure that makes Harvey Mudd such a center of success and excellence, its remarkable staff and faculty, have passed on to your class their great gifts of knowledge and experience.

Now it is up to you. Remain true to yourselves and to your families and strive to live as men and women of value.

The generations of Americans that have preceded you this century fought tyranny, opposed aggression, and struggled against intolerance. They dared to dream great dreams and they worked hard to turn those dreams into reality long before you had even heard of Harvey Mudd.

Today, you are the beneficiaries of their struggles and their crowning triumph, an America that is strong and free, and still the richest, most vibrant, and most productive nation on this earth. We are rich with educated citizens, caring families, and innovative leaders. But more importantly, we are rich in ideas and rich in principles, and rich in you, the most promising generation in our history — the generation that will lead America into the twenty-first century.

At some point in the distant future, many of you in the Class of 1997 will once again find yourselves sitting at a commencement, but this time for your children.

I hope that you will look back to this day and remember that your commencement speaker was a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who spoke not of war, not of the defense budget, or of the threats to national security, but rather who shared your joy and your hopes, and spoke about the unprecedented opportunities which are waiting for you, and of the courage and character it will require to reap the harvest of your labors.

And decades hence, as you sit proudly at your children's commencement, I hope you sit there not only as successful

scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, but also as loving parents, proud of the example you have set and the children of value that you have raised under your thoughtful guidance.

If you accomplish all that, you will then understand how your parents feel today.

We all wish you that day, but meanwhile, today is a wonderful day, the first day of your new life. So go out and celebrate, you deserve it.

Good luck to you all and may God Bless you and may God Bless the United States of America

**Quadrennial Defense Review Testimony
Senate Armed Services Committee
Washington, DC
20 May 1997**

I welcome the opportunity to be here today with Secretary Cohen to discuss with you the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review and to endorse the results of the challenging and vitally important process you placed into law last year.

Let me begin by outlining just how extensive has been the involvement of the Service Chiefs, the Combatant Commanders, their staffs, as well as the OSD and Joint Staffs, in this Defense Review. In fact, the level of CINC and Service Chief involvement in this process has been unprecedented and has been a major strength of this review. In dozens of briefings and scores of meetings, their insights and perspectives bolstered our analysis at every step.

From the beginning we were determined to conduct a strategy driven defense review and we've just done that.

ASSESSMENT PROCESS

We learned much during the last 4 years. We learned that the strategy required us to look at more than just major theater wars beginning from a cold start. So we undertook an assessment across the entire spectrum of anticipated operations, from the specific military tasks to do the shaping, through small-scale contingencies, to major theater wars.

We used a broad array of different analytical tools, from seminars, war games, and computer modeling, to intensive sessions with senior civilian and military leaders, involving hundreds of people over a period of four months.

We brought in CINC War Planners and Service War Planners, as well as other experts; more than 200 professionals to wargame the forces necessary to meet future requirements, then we met face-to-face with the deputy CINCs to validate our findings.

We understand well what demands are placed on our force. The force is working hard to protect American interests and prevent regional crises from escalating.

We reconfirmed what parts of the force are busier than others and we learned where we might thin the force. And we drew upon the exhaustive analyses conducted by the CINCs' staffs in preparing their Major Theater War Plans that have been developed over the last four years.

Based on the strategy and this rigorous and comprehensive examination, the Joint Chiefs, the CINCs, and I believe that the force you see depicted here is the force America needs to protect and advance our interests as we enter the 21st Century.

- While maintaining a 10 division Force Structure, the Army will accelerate its Force XXI modernization plan. Also, a reduction of some 15,000 active duty personnel will be carried out by deactivation, consolidation, and realignment of headquarters and support facilities.
- The Army will also restructure its Reserve component. It will shed some guard combat structure that provided for strategic depth during the Cold War but which is now excess. It will also accelerate conversion of some units from combat, to combat support roles, relieving an important warfighting shortfall. These adjustments will result in a Reserve and Guard end strength reduction of some 45,000 personnel.
- The Navy will retain 12 Carrier Battle Groups and 12 Amphibious Ready Groups but will reduce the number of surface combatants in the fleet from 128 to 116 to reflect the more capable ships now coming on line. We revalidated that our submarine force can be reduced from 73 to 50 boats.

- These fleet reductions, combined with streamlining of overseas infrastructure, and the transfer of some combat logistics functions to the Military Sealift Command will allow the Navy to reduce active and Reserve end strength by 18,000 and 4,100 personnel, respectively.
- The Air Force will maintain 20 fighter wings but will consolidate fighter and bomber units to streamline its command structure. This will result in a force structure of just over 12 active fighter wings and 8 reserve wings. The Air Force will pursue an aggressive outsourcing plan. It will reduce its force structure for continental air defense and handle the U.S. air sovereignty missions with other forces. These initiatives will allow the Air Force to realize a reduction of approximately 27,000 active duty personnel.
- The Marine Corps will maintain a three Marine Expeditionary Force capability to support the strategy but will take modest reductions in end strength through restructuring.

We also examined our nuclear force posture. Until START II is ratified by the Duma, the law mandates maintaining the START I Force. However, we remain committed to START II and a possible START III and could use savings from these reductions to further our National Missile Defense program.

This next slide provides a summary of our end strength adjustments. The total active duty end strength will be adjusted down 36 percent from 1989, Reserve forces down 29 percent from 1989, Civilian personnel down 42 percent from 1989. We believe we can make these reductions and still support the strategy. Let me point out that while these reductions are essential if we are to meet our modernization goals, they will not be easy. And these are not "positions" or "spaces," they are people. Every man and woman who leaves the service is a unique story in his or her own right.

To keep faith with our people, our most precious resource, we must offer a wide range of programs and services as we did during previous drawdowns. These programs, instituted by Congress, should include early retirement and voluntary separation programs, selected continuation of benefits for separated members, and comprehensive transition support assistance. Some of these tools will expire at the end of FY99 and we will ask Congress that they be continued beyond then so we can implement these reductions fairly and compassionately.

Our major strength is our men and women, they and their families must remain our highest priority and we must continue to provide for their quality of life.

From the beginning of this process we were conscious that we must balance the requirement to invest in the force of tomorrow with the requirement to field a trained and ready force today. It would make little sense to break today's force to pay for tomorrow's.

As we all know, readiness in today's force is already challenged by the high operating tempo we face in every service. But we believe we can reduce the stress on the force in a number of ways to improve time at home for our service members with their families and still maintain a high level of operational readiness.

First, we will continue to fully fund current readiness. Next, we must look more closely at how we employ units which are in high demand such as our Patriot air defense units, and electronic warfare aircraft, or air and military police just to name a few. We will also make prudent man-year reductions in major service and joint exercises. Our business is all about making tough choices about who goes where, when, and for how long, and the overall impact on readiness and quality of life is a big factor in those decisions.

But as much as we emphasized today's readiness, our eye was always on the future and on a vision to guide our modernization efforts to assure our military's excellence well into the 21st century. Last year we introduced *Joint Vision 2010*, our unifying vision based upon Revolution in Military Affairs technologies and on new operational concepts as shown on the chart.

Dominant Maneuver will emphasize mobile and agile organizations to rapidly and decisively employ widely dispersed forces to attack enemy weak points throughout the full depth of the battlefield. **Precision Engagement** will enable our forces to better locate the targets that count and to strike with decisive results and with minimum effort. **Full Dimensional Protection** will rely on active and passive measures to protect our forces and **Focused Logistics** will feature fusing information transportation and other logistics technologies to allow the precise, on-time delivery of support.

Undergirding these concepts is information superiority, the ability to collect process and distribute vast amounts of information to our forces while denying that same capability to a potential enemy. In effect, *JV2010* captures the RMA and it is the umbrella concept for bringing together Service visions and experiments that will lead to our force for the 21st Century.

To realize our vision of the future we must take steps to free resources for investment in modernization. Our challenge is to capture this potential for tomorrow while preserving a healthy force today. We believe the QDR balances these competing requirements. For the near-term the QDR concludes that we can move towards a leaner force by reorganizing headquarters, trimming support functions, improving our ability to manage OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO, and re-aligning reserve forces. Implicit in this effort must be additional base closures. As unpleasant as this may be, I do not see how we can get there from here without closing bases we don't need.

This will require sustained, genuine collaboration and cooperation among the Department, the Services, and the Congress. Along the way we must never lose sight of our bedrock commitment to our people, both uniformed and civilian. Keeping faith with them is good policy and it is the right thing to do.

The QDR provides a rational, prudent, and well thought out approach to keep our Armed Forces strong and American interests protected for many years to come. Most important, it set as its standard whether the recommendations would lead to a better, more effective joint force best suited over the near-, mid-, and long-term to protect America's interests and I support its recommendations.

Dinner Remarks
Military Survivors/Tragedy Assistance Program for Survivors (TAPS)
24 May 1997

Thank you very much for asking Joannie and I to come and share this time with you. I just thought I'd talk to you and I will be the first one to find out what I'm going to say — and you'll be the second one!

It is true that Joannie found out about TAPS about a year and a half ago and shortly thereafter she told me about it. And it's also fair to say that anyone who hears about it — anyone in my business — stands sort of surprised that it has taken so many years to create something like TAPS. But you stand in absolute awe of what it is you're doing — absolute awe. And when you trace back the wars that we have had, and the service men and women we have lost, in the times between the wars and accidents and so forth, how thankful I am that Bonnie and the rest of you would band together and do this.

I asked Bonnie earlier when you were sitting here how large your family now is, and how wide your net is cast. Because it would be shame on all of us if we did not try to get the word out faster and further, so that others may benefit from what you do for each other.

So let me tell you I'm amazed at what you do, I'm so thankful that you all thought of this, and I'm particularly thankful that you have all banded together to help each other like this. I know we are in the mood of applauding people, so let me applaud all of you.

Bonnie mentioned in my bio that I am the military advisor to the President and the Secretary of Defense and the National Security Council, and so as you can well imagine I often testify before Congress and talk to them about our strategy and why it is that our service men and women serve all over the world. I testify before them about the needs of our military: why we should be a certain size; and what weapon systems we ought to have; and what programs we should have. We talk an awful lot about what this force of ours does, and what demands we put upon our men and women and their families.

It is extraordinary to me as I travel from one part of the world to the other, and meet with our service men and women — in the last few months Joannie and I went to Saudi Arabia, and the Sinai, and Korea, and Japan, and the East and West Coast, and Panama — no matter where you go, you are struck by how extraordinarily well we do and in what high esteem our armed forces are held.

Because I think we are without any doubt the best military in the world — bar none. I think we are because when I go and talk to my counterparts, it is clear, in the envy they express, that they would like to be like us. As a matter of fact, Joannie and I just came back from China on Sunday, and even there when I talked to my counterpart and when I talked to the other military — we went to visit an airborne division — everywhere you go people talk to us about wanting to be like us and wanting to duplicate us.

I could tell you about the trips I've taken to Russia and the same thing is true. While they're not quite sure yet whether they should be or want to be our friends, they do know that they want to be like us. They want to be as professional, they want to be as competent, they want to be as STRAC as the U.S. military.

But you know what comes through very loud and clear? We are not envied because we have the best nuclear

submarines; we are not envied because our aircraft carriers are mightier than anyone else's; or because our airplanes or our tanks are any better - they are, they're all better, no doubt about it.

But that's not why we're envied. We're envied for one simple reason — because those men and women who wear America's uniform are so absolutely remarkable. I am sometimes amazed. We send them to the far corners of the world, to places like Bosnia, to places like Zaire, where we've just had some 200 marines — and we were just able to issue them deployment orders to come home — standing by there to rescue American citizens. They just finished that kind of job in Albania. Not long ago that same group was in a place you never hear of — Rwanda — in a town called Kigali.

Others are in the Sinai, and have been there ever since President Carter signed the Camp David Accords and agreed that the U.S. military would send some thousand men and women to the middle of the Sinai to establish a line between the Egyptians and the Israelis. And they have been there for well over a decade. And it goes like clockwork. If any of you would have seen it you would be absolutely amazed.

There is a string of outposts throughout the desert in the Sinai, eight or ten men to an outpost, run by a sergeant, and yet for all these years (they rotate the units every six months) have you ever heard of an embarrassment or a problem? Name me just one military that could do that.

Or, not so many months ago, when shooting broke out in a place called Liberia, we received an urgent call to send someone there to help Americans, because the embassy was under fire. Within 24 hours men from the Air Force, men and women from the Navy, from the Marine Corps, from the Army and Special Forces were on the way, and in less than 24 hours the first people were being assembled and picked up to be taken to safety.

Before this group of some 2,000 people was finished, they had rescued well over 3,000 noncombatants from 60 different countries, mostly under fire. No one was injured, no one was scratched, and when they came home did you ever read about it in the Washington Post or your local newspaper? Not at all. And that's because people have already assumed that that's how the U.S. military would work — it's become routine.

I tell you all that because I take such enormous pride in the competence of our men and women, in the caring that they have for each another. We don't go out into the middle of the Sinai alone. We take care of each other. We're all part of a family and we take care of each other. That's what makes this military so great.

I would also tell you that despite the occasional scandal, these are men and women of extraordinary character — extraordinary character. They're patriots, first and foremost, that care about each other, and that care about what is right and wrong. The vast, vast majority do the harder right.

And I will tell you, without having met them, that your spouses carried that same color of the United States military like the people I just spoke of. They were the world's best. Whatever your feelings are inside, you all must individually decide, but you've got to know that what they did and how they did it is just unequaled.

And the outfit they belonged to, whether it's the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, or Coast Guard, is one first class outfit. That will stay with you and in the memories of your children for the rest of your lives and nothing anyone can say or do can ever erase that.

So when I testify before Congress and talk about those things, I remind them that we ought to worry less about the tanks and ships and planes we buy. We ought to worry more about keeping those remarkable men and women and their families, because they are America's treasure. You have to remember, and those young men and women that I talk to all over the world remind me, they don't ask much of us.

Just like your husbands and wives didn't ask much of you. They don't ask much of us at all. First and foremost they want an opportunity to just how good they are. They want an opportunity for a job where they can grow and produce. They want an opportunity to raise their children, and to take care of their families — not lavishly, or they wouldn't be in this business. They wouldn't be wearing uniforms.

But they do know they don't want their time wasted. They do know that they want to be the best, whether he or she is an infantryman or a clerk typist or a cook or a medic. They want to have the feeling inside that we trained them right and have given them the opportunity to become the very best.

And they want to know that when send them on these gosh awful deployments, as we do entirely too often, that there's some system back here that will take care of them and their families. That there's decent housing. That there's a school for the kids. That there's a clinic or hospital where they can take a child if the child is sick. So these warriors that we send out don't have to look over their shoulders and worry all the time whether the family's being taken care of.

And so taking care of our men and women and their families is really a readiness issue. It's a very selfish readiness issue on my part, because otherwise they will worry more about what's happening back home, or worry more about whether they're good enough for the job or not, than about doing the job they've been trained to do.

I think that ultimately, Congress sometimes has difficulty understanding that because there are such enormous pressures to buy weapons systems, because they mean jobs. So you all also have a responsibility, at every opportunity, to make clear that what you really ought to be worrying about is that we create the conditions — so that young men and women who are in our force today are willing to stay with us, and that we've created the right conditions so we can recruit more like them.

Sometimes, however, we need more than that. Because as you all so painfully, painfully know, there comes a moment when you lose someone you've loved very dearly. And that brings us full circle back to TAPS. I have been thinking since I heard about TAPS, why is it that the military never created something like that? And then it became patently clear to me that there's no way to organize something like that in the military.

What would we do? Have lieutenant so-and-so, or sergeant so-and-so call you and talk to you? A young man or woman who simply cannot share your experience? It can't be done. It can only be done by people who have walked this very difficult road before you, and who are now willing to devote their energies and their caring and their heart, to pick up your hand and say, "Hey, walk with me, I can help you."

We cannot do this. We can do it as individuals but not as an organization. I only wish that you grow, that you cast your net further. I will help you with that, with somehow getting you the resources so that you can reach more and help more.

Some time ago, a long time ago, there was a young man whose wife died. That young man wrote home and said, "I know that tomorrow, and the next day, the sun will rise again. But for me I don't think it will shine as brightly. And I know I will laugh again, but I'm not sure there'll be as much joy in my laughter ever again."

How wrong that young man was! There's something absolutely wonderful about time. Time doesn't allow us to forget those things about which we really care. But time casts them in a different light. Life really does go on. That young man today, having grown older, looks at the sunshine and the sunshine is as bright as it ever was. The laughter around him is just as joyous as it ever could have been.

There's something very special about time. Remember that. For each of you it will be different. For some it takes longer, for some not. There's no easy formula. But it works.

Last Sunday, Joannie and I were returning from China and we stopped off in California where I was to give a commissioning address at one of the universities there. Beforehand there was an ROTC commissioning. One of the young officers that I was commissioning was the brother of an Air Force captain who died last December in an aircraft accident. He had been an instructor pilot.

I had been told that he really wanted to be there as his younger brother was commissioned. I looked at the mother who was sitting there. It was not yet time to see the sun as brightly as she had seen it before. The laughter, I am sure, wasn't as joyful as it was before her oldest son had died. But I am sure that she was there because she knew that through her younger son, through that experience and that life that he was going to take on, and by being there and by watching her younger son being commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Air Force, she too was going towards that day when the sun would be just as bright as ever, and laughter would be just as joyful. That's what TAPS is all about, isn't it?

I wish you all the very best. God Bless you all, and thank you for what your husbands and wives did. And thank you very much for what you are doing. God Bless you.

**Conference of Presidents of
Major Jewish Organizations
New York, New York
27 May 1997**

It is a pleasure to be here, finally. This luncheon on this important topic has been a long time coming. For the nation's military leadership, the last year has been a whirlwind: dozens of operations; Bosnia; terrorism; problems with Iraq; and lately, the Quadrennial Defense Review. On top of this, travel to Europe, Asia, and the Middle East has kept me hopping.

It has been difficult to escape the gravity field of the Pentagon and reach "Planet Reality," which on my map is anywhere outside the Washington Beltway. Even the island of Manhattan qualifies for that status!

I would like to address for you today, two very important subjects, both related, but each important in its own right: first, our new strategy and how it came about; and secondly, our overall strategy in the Middle East with an emphasis on

the role that the Department of Defense plays in that strategy. I also want to leave at least half of the time for your questions.

But permit me first to backtrack over some familiar terrain.

While many expected better times, the Cold War was followed by a Hot Peace, where the relative stability of the Superpower standoff gave way to a world dominated by ethnic conflict, disintegrating states, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and in the Middle East, that old standby, naked aggression.

Our force — a third smaller than it was during the Cold War — has been busier than any non-wartime force in our history. After the Cold War, we structured our force to be ready to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts, one in the Middle East, the other against our old and still dangerous nemesis in Northeast Asia.

But as we began our Quadrennial Review in August of 1996, we questioned whether the “two conflict” approach was the only suitable focus for the Armed Forces. To answer this question, we first looked at the environment and found that out to the year 2010, we faced the same kinds of challenges that we have today, but only more so. For example, alongside the need to be able to deal with regional conflicts, we have to prepare for asymmetrical threats, like more sophisticated terrorism, the use of chemical or even biological weapons, or attacks on our information infrastructure. We also found that out beyond 2010, there was a possibility that a new peer competitor might emerge.

Rather than simply reacting to overseas crises, we based our new strategy on three elements — first, shaping the environment to prepare or deter wars before they start, using such tools as security assistance, peacekeeping, forward presence, and military-to-military contacts.

Second, maintaining the capability to respond to two major theater wars, as well as smaller contingencies. For shaping the environment and responding to crises, we decided in the QDR to cut very little of our overworked combat “teeth,” but to make cuts in the infrastructure “tail” of all our forces.

And finally, the last element of our new defense strategy is preparing now for a future beyond the year 2010 that could be significantly more challenging than today’s environment. Simply stated, this means we must reinvigorate our modernization program, fund it in a steady manner, and take advantage of what has been called the Revolution in Military Affairs. To afford this at a time when defense resources will remain constant or even shrink, we will have to become more efficient, reducing our basing infrastructure, and relying more on privatization and outsourcing.

Now, how does this global strategy apply to the Middle East?

Our new National Security Strategy, signed less than two weeks ago by President Clinton, describes three specific and familiar U.S. interests in the region: advance the peace process among Israel and its neighbors; help Israel to maintain its security and its qualitative edge; and maintain access to Persian Gulf oil, which also requires us to help our Arab friends in that critical region.

Let’s look at each of these three interests in turn.

Today, we may take the peace process for granted. But seven years ago, peace in the Middle East was a dream, a fantasy. The region was frozen in hatred, and Israel’s recently concluded war in Lebanon was then still an open wound. There were no Arab-Israeli negotiations. But as David Ben-Gurion said, in Israel, in order to be a realist, you must believe in miracles. And what a miracle took place! None other than Saddam Hussein provided the catalyst for change!

After our stunning victory in the Gulf War, the hard-line states and some of the non-state actors realized that they were losing their base of support. The miracle of peace became the only realistic alternative. Together with help from the United States and lots of creative diplomacy, Israel, Egypt, the Palestinians, and Jordan have all made great inroads toward that peace. But there are still significant challenges to a comprehensive peace settlement — agreements need to be made between Israel and Syria, and Israel and Lebanon to name just two.

For our part, I think that the United States has played a significant role. We have attempted to mediate the dispute, but we have always maintained that the parties must be willing to make peace among themselves. On my end, we provided the military advice to Ambassador Ross and his delegation. My most senior Assistants, the latest of which has been Lieutenant General Dick Myers, have been on the case since 1991. Our most important contribution has been in advising Ambassador Ross on the military aspects of security issues related to Israel and Syria. In fact, we actually participated in the Israel-Syria negotiations that took place at the Wye Plantation in 1996. That track is now stalled, but if Israel and the Palestinians return to the table, there is some hope that Israel and Syria will again find their way clear to engage in negotiations.

We will also look to Israel’s other neighbors to play a strong role in the search for peace. President Mubarak and I have discussed this many times, and I know that he feels very deeply about achieving a comprehensive and lasting peace. Likewise, King Hussein believes and has demonstrated that peace is not just a series of agreements, but that peace is also something that must be made between peoples. Reconciliation in his view is crucial, if peace is to flourish.

The United States will continue to work with both of these nations to strengthen their economies, as well as their security. But as Abba Ebban told us, we must not only judge diplomacy by what it does, but we must also judge it by what it prevents. And we have been active in preventing conflict in the Middle East, as well.

Since 1982, pursuant to the Camp David Accords, we have stationed nearly 1,000 U.S. soldiers in the Sinai to serve as part of a multinational peacekeeping force on the Israeli-Egyptian border. This means that we have contributed over 15,000 U.S. man-years worth of effort to keeping the peace there. In my view, this force has done great work and that work will continue for the foreseeable future.

But our actions to prevent war are not limited to diplomacy or peacekeeping operations. Sadly, we live in a world where, just as in the days of the Roman Empire, if you want peace, you must prepare for war. Preventing war also means supporting your allies and maintaining your readiness for war, which is still the best deterrent.

Our second major objective is to help Israel maintain its security and its qualitative edge of military superiority. And to do this, we have established a highly effective military-to-military relationship. Over the past decade, our relationship has reached an extent that it rivals any of the relationships that we have with even our closest NATO allies. Permit me to read just a handful of the most important indicators of the scale of our efforts.

First, in the area of financing, we have kept Israeli economic and military aid at three billion dollars per year, roughly 54 percent of all U.S. foreign assistance. U.S. contributions, including grant military aid, represent about 30 percent of the Israeli defense budget and provide the main support for the Arrow Theater Missile Defense system, as well as many other programs.

Second, in the equipment area, we have provided Israel some of the best equipment in the world including this year: the F-15 strike fighter; the Apache helicopter; and the Multiple Launch Rocket System.

Third, in the area of training, we are training 500 Israeli officers per year in U.S. military courses. Add to all of this, our comprehensive intelligence exchanges, our liaison officers, our joint war reserve stockpiles, our 10 large-scale joint exercises each year, our 60 or so naval ship visits each year, and you have one of the most intense military relationships in the world, and it is one I am personally very proud of.

One other aspect of this relationship, a personal one for me, is the relationship between the Israeli and American high commands. It is an intense and fruitful relationship. For example, I visited my counterpart, General Amnon Shahak, in January 1997, and he will visit me in the Pentagon for two days next week. Given all that I have told you that we have in common, I think you can see that we will have plenty to talk about.

In summary, let me say this about our strategic relationship.

The strategic relationship between the U.S. and Israel is deep. And the strategic benefits and the practical advantage of things like intelligence exchanges are considerable, and this intense, defense relationship clearly remains in the U.S. national interest.

Our third major interest is to maintain access to Persian Gulf oil and to work for stability in the region. This objective, quite obviously, has significant components that are not military. But let me stick to the military aspects of it. Also, let me narrow the focus here, and talk mainly about Iran and Iraq.

The only good news here is that they dislike each other with a visceral passion that will, for the foreseeable future, prevent them from any sort of significant coordinated action. They are both radical states but each offers a different type of the threat. Iraq is a conventional military threat to its neighbors, but, after DESERT STORM, much less of one. Their capacity for mischief in the region, however, remains significant. Iran's current threat to our interests is one that centers on international subversion and terrorism. But, in the long run, its international connections and its assets make it a more significant threat.

Let me add here, that Iran's military is becoming increasingly potent. Their power projection assets in the form of ballistic missiles, cruise missile boats, submarines and mining assets are especially worrisome. And I can tell you, that we are speaking very frankly to the nations who are selling Iran those weapons. For example, I was in China last week, and I frequently brought up our views about their arms sales to Iran in my discussions with their military leaders. We have discussed this issue with Russia, as well.

Our overall policy toward Iran and Iraq is one of dual containment. I know that many of you saw the recent *Foreign Affairs* article by Brzezinski and Scowcroft, which criticized in very measured terms this policy of dual containment. In truth, it is a difficult policy and a fractious one at home and abroad, especially in Europe. Still, dual containment is the right policy, and given the unaltered hostility of both of these states and the lack of more beneficial alternatives, dual containment is also the best policy.

In support of our policy, our operations on and around the Arabian Peninsula are extensive. The U.S., along with Britain and France, maintain a NORTHERN WATCH and SOUTHERN WATCH air operation to patrol the no-fly

zones in Iraq. These are extensive operations, which have entailed over 125 thousand sorties since they began in August 1992. We also maintain a Maritime Intercept Operation in the Gulf to help prevent smuggling and violations of the U.N. resolutions. And finally, we have also prepositioned a brigade's worth of equipment in Kuwait, and we also maintain a very active land-air exercise program there. On any given day, we have around 20,000 U.S. military personnel on or around the Arabian peninsula.

Let me end my discussion of the Gulf region by noting that especially after the tragedy last summer at Khobar Towers in Dhahran, we have redoubled our efforts against terrorism.

Because United States is so strong, our enemies worldwide favor the use of terrorism, which in many cases is the only weapon they can use against us.

Today, terrorism itself is better funded and much more sophisticated than it was a decade ago. We are working much harder against terrorism on the national level, and we have redoubled our efforts in the Pentagon at Force Protection. I have told my staff that we must make the U.S. Armed Forces the world's acknowledged leader in force protection and dealing with terrorism. The way nations come to us to learn about submarines or jet fighters, I want them to come here to learn how to combat terrorism. We are also exchanging information with nations like Israel and Great Britain, which have great antiterrorist experience. We have a long way to go reach our goal, but we are working furiously to get there. We know that the lives of our men and women in uniform depend on it!

Well, I have gone on too long.

In summary, let me say that I think we have an effective Middle East policy. On U.S.-Israel relations, I personally and thoroughly agree with my good friend Madeline Albright, who said ten days ago that, "The U.S. relationship with Israel is an especially close one. It is based on shared interests, the closest cultural ties, and a shared desire for peace in the Middle East. This Administration's support for the security and well-being of Israel is without parallel."

I also believe that our policy in the Gulf is the right one and especially that our forces there are doing a great job deterring Saddam and serving too as a visible symbol of our commitment and a positive force for stability in the region. Overall, while much remains to be done in the region, much has been accomplished. We are on the right path.

**Brazilian War College
Rio De Janeiro, Brazil
22 July 1997**

It is a great pleasure for me to be back in Brazil and to have the opportunity to speak once again to the future leaders of Brazil's Armed Forces.

During my four years as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have found that I always learn more by taking your questions and listening to your comments than you typically learn by hearing me give a long speech. So what I would like to do today is talk for a little while, but leave enough time to hear what you have to say.

If the Commandant will allow me, I will take the liberty of asking the junior officer in the audience to wave his hat when he feels I have talked too long. Although I must tell you that when I tried this at the U.S. Army War College, 200 officers started waving their hats after only five minutes!

As a result of my visits to Brazil, my contacts with your superb forces, and during meetings and conversations with General Leonel, I have developed a special place in my heart for Brazil because in many ways it reminds me so very much of the United States. Brazil, like the United States, is a country so large and diverse that little can be called typically Brazilian. From the pine forests of the south, to the tropical cities along the equator, to the excitement of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil is a collage of many cultures and many landscapes, just as is the United States. But no picture is as bright as one snapshot of Brazil's Armed Forces.

The important role you have assumed in a large number of United Nations and regional peacekeeping operations, from El Salvador to Rwanda, from Bosnia to Angola, has served as an excellent example of international responsibility. I salute Brazil's dedication and commitment to the world in the name of democracy and freedom and peace. But now, as most of you realize, it is time for our countries to prepare for the new century.

And after thinking long and hard about what I should talk to you all about, it occurred to me that the best use of my time today is to talk to you about all the changes taking place in America's military, strategy, and force structure, as we prepare for the challenges looming on the horizon. But the challenges we face are not unique to the United States. These are topics facing many countries around the world including Brazil.

After nearly eight years of operating in the post Cold War environment, it became clear that we faced in the United

States three facts of life. And it also became obvious that how we responded to these issues would have dramatic effects on what military capabilities we would have and how well we will be able to protect America's vital interests in the future.

The first fact of life for America's armed forces is that much of our equipment and our weapon systems will soon be reaching the end of their useful service lives and will have to be replaced. We were very lucky during the early 1980s. It was a period of greatly increased defense spending, spending that allowed us to modernize and equip our forces with the latest in military technologies. You saw many of these systems used during the Gulf War weapon systems like stealth fighters, the M1-A2 tank, F-15 strike eagles, precision munitions, and Aegis cruisers. But now more than 20 years after many of these systems were purchased, our aircraft, ships, computer systems, and combat vehicles are becoming very expensive to repair and maintain in combat ready condition.

Additionally, a fair percentage of our equipment is simply wearing out as a result of our high operations and exercise tempo. It is clear that we must begin replacing the old systems and equipment. In business they call this "re-capitalization," that is making the necessary capital investments in equipment and inventory to keep you competitive in the marketplace. And the estimated cost of re-capitalizing our force is approximately twenty-five percent more than we currently spend each year on new procurement.

The second fact we must face is that the American defense budget is not going to get any larger. The defense budget has already been reduced by some 40 percent just since 1989. But there are tremendous pressures on the President and our Congress to balance the national budget. At best, we can expect U.S. defense spending to level out at the current rate; thus, unless we change the way we do business, we will not have enough money to replace and to modernize our equipment.

The third fact of life, and one that makes this such a complicated problem to solve, is that in the midst of our shrinking budget and the need to modernize our force, we find that our forces have never been busier. I think it would be safe to say our operations tempo has been the busiest we have ever seen during a time of peace.

Just since I became Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, American forces have participated in dozens of military operations and Joint Task Force deployments around the world, protecting a variety of American interests and supporting United Nations objectives. Everything from Non-Combatant Evacuations in places like Albania, Rwanda, and Liberia, where on that one mission alone we evacuated 2,300 citizens of some 60 nations; to the enforcement of U.N. sanctions against Iraq and the Military Observer Mission on the Peru-Ecuador border; an operation you are all intimately familiar with, to the NATO deployment in Bosnia, our largest operation since DESERT STORM. Some of these missions we have been doing so long that most Americans have completely forgot about them. Our observer mission in the Sinai Desert for example, has been watching the peace between Egypt and Israel since 1982.

So the difficulty facing America is how do we continue to protect our vital and important interests around the world and still accomplish the modernization we require for the next century? Before we could begin to develop a strategy that could effectively address these issues, it was important to first understand what the world would look like in the near-, mid-, and long-term and what security challenges we might face. After a lengthy review by many military and civilian experts in and outside the Department of Defense, we found a number of key characteristics of the future security environment.

First, the good news is that America is not likely to face a peer competitor, that is, a nation capable of successfully threatening our vital national interests with conventional forces, at least not until the year 2010 or beyond. But this doesn't mean we can take it easy. Because the experts also agree that although America would not see a major competitor emerge, we would continue to face a large number of crises and potential conflicts resulting from the "growing pains" of the post Cold War period and many of these crises and conflicts could have a very serious effect on important American worldwide interests if left unattended.

There are many, many lingering disputes remaining and anyone of these minor crises could potentially erupt into a larger regional conflict that might affect America's economic interests, endanger the lives of our citizens abroad, threaten our friends or allies, or demand humanitarian assistance. Brazilian forces have seen these contentious problems erupt into conflict during your peacekeeping operations in such places as Mozambique, the former Yugoslavia, and Angola, and you also have come to understand there is almost an endless number of ethnic, ideological, and political disputes that are greatly complicating efforts to maintain a peaceful and secure environment.

It was also the consensus of the experts that America will need to continue to maintain the capability to prosecute two near simultaneous major theater wars, potentially in the Middle East and in the Pacific, as long as Iran and Iraq continued to threaten the stability of the Middle East and the situation on the Korean Peninsula remained as unstable as it is today.

But there are also those who would wish the United States harm but cannot compete militarily with our forces. So alongside the need to be able to deal with regional conflicts, we have to prepare for asymmetrical threats, like more sophisticated terrorism utilizing chemical or even biological weapons or attacks on our information infrastructure.

Once we understood the security environment we would face well into the next century, we brought together the best strategic thinkers to help develop a defense strategy best suited to advance and protect America's worldwide interests well into the next century. Three words best describe our new defense strategy: shape; respond; and prepare.

First, we will focus on shaping the environment to advance peace and stability, deter wars, and prevent crises from escalating using such tools as security assistance forward presence and peacekeeping operations.

Second, we will maintain the capability to respond to crises, should they occur. For America this means everything from two major theater wars to the many smaller contingencies we see today as well.

The third element of our new defense strategy is preparing now for a future beyond the year 2010 that could be significantly more challenging than today's environment.

Simply stated this means we must reinvigorate our modernization programs with the new information, stealth, and precision strike technologies that used together will produce a revolution in military affairs, that in time will keep American armed forces the strongest in the world.

To afford a comprehensive modernization program at a time when defense resources will remain constant or even shrink, we will have to make radical changes in the way we do business. We will have to further cut some of our bases, further reduce and realign our force size, significantly reduce the number of people in higher headquarters, and move more towards privatization and outsourcing and in some instances, buy fewer numbers of some weapon systems than originally planned.

You will notice that I have said that the United States will have to cut more of its bases and accomplish additional reductions in the total number of people in our armed forces.

Since 1989, we have already cut thirty-three percent or approximately 700,000 people from our armed forces. If you want to know how many people that is you can take all the active military forces of the United Kingdom, add to them the forces of Germany, and for good measure add those of the Netherlands and Denmark. Even then you still don't reach 700,000.

Many of the personnel reductions made the past few years have come from our deployable combat units. Because we envision being so busy the next few years, the next series of cuts will have to come from non-deploying support personnel and functions. But while we have cut our people by one-third, we have only cut our infrastructure, which includes such things as our maintenance depots, support facilities, and laboratories, by only about twenty-one percent. So clearly there is some excess support capacity that we can eliminate in order to save money for modernization and also pay the bills for our very high readiness.

The good news is that we have learned to be more efficient in many of our support areas by looking at how private businesses operate. Not only are we adopting new business practices, but we are relying on the creative ideas of our people to innovate and find new ways to do their jobs smarter and less expensively.

But the bad news is that closing additional military bases in the United States is a very difficult political problem. If you are a Congressman and have a base in your district, you will probably not be willing to give up the jobs and economic benefits that come to local communities by having a military installation close by.

Another major component of our plan to save money in the support areas involves the transfer of many non-combat support functions to civilian businesses. Those of you who have attended pilot training in the United States, for example, may have noticed that aircraft maintenance for our training aircraft and simulator training and maintenance is largely done by private contractors.

So what type of American military will you see in the next century and what are the implications for Brazil?

In the long term, by the period 2010-2015, you will see a slightly smaller but very more lethal U.S. force on the battlefield, in the air, and on the seas. It will be more mobile, be stealthier, and be able to deliver munitions with great precision and will see the battlefield and command forces with greater effectiveness than ever before.

Many of the challenges posing dangers to the peace, continued democratization, and stability of the world are not challenges that concern only us or that we can handle alone. All across the globe, women and children are dying from starvation, disease, ethnic cleansing, and stray bullets brought on by those with no regard for humanity or the international norms of behavior. There must a new level of involvement, a new sense of caring, and a new understanding of international responsibility if we are to make the 21st century a century of peace and not another century of war.

I know that Brazil has these qualities and has demonstrated its capacity for leadership on a number of important United Nations and regional missions, particularly since 1991. I would ask that we work together as partners, along

with the other caring nations of the world, in helping address these serious issues and making the world a better place for our children.

Since I see several hats waving in the back of the auditorium please allow me a few words before I take your questions.

The history of relations between the United States and the nations of the Americas, including Brazil, this past century has been dotted with political, economic, and diplomatic difficulties and I will be the first to admit this.

But we are standing on the threshold of a new century and we have a chance for a fresh beginning and a new partnership based on new levels of trust and confidence, particularly between those of us who wear uniforms.

I ask that you never forget that it was Brazil that stood side by side with American soldiers on the bloody battlefields of a World War that threatened the peace of the world. It was the forces of Brazil integrated into the U.S. Fifth Army that fought a difficult and deadly battle at Monte Castello in Italy. And it was your forces that after three months of fierce fighting with the Germans finally managed to take the rugged hills. It was also the Brazilian division which at Fornovo moved rapidly to cut off the withdrawal of the 148th German division and remnants of two other divisions capturing two German generals 800 officers and more than 14,000 German soldiers.

The past two years we have once again stood together in the interests of peace along the Ecuador-Peru border.

We have a friendship and camaraderie that comes from dodging the same bullets and fighting for the same causes. This relationship must be cherished and nurtured and we must never allow trivial matters to affect this special bond between our forces.

**Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention
Salt Lake City, Utah
18 August 1997**

Ladies and gentlemen, it is certainly a great honor to receive the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Dwight David Eisenhower Award. And of course, it's also great to be out here with you in Salt Lake City, because, among other things, that means that I am not back there in the Pentagon!

You know, after the war, General Eisenhower was called back from Europe to serve in the Pentagon. But for Ike, coming to grips with the size of this monstrous building was a particular challenge. In later years, Ike was fond of telling his friends the tale of the hapless Army Air Corps Captain, who came to the Pentagon right after it opened in 1943. The poor Captain got so lost that, by the time he reached his destination, he found out that he had been promoted to Bird Colonel.

But even today, there are lots of jokes about the Pentagon and how many people work there. A former Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger, when asked how many people work in the Pentagon, used to reply, "about a third." Perhaps closer to the mark, a former Secretary of the Navy used to say that the Pentagon reminded him of a log floating rapidly downstream, covered with 20,000 ants, each of them convinced that he was steering.

With all that, you will understand why I think it is so great to be away from the Pentagon and out here in God's country and among so many friends and heroes.

And my friends, let me say that as a man who came to our great country as a teenage refugee from war-torn Europe, it is a special thrill to receive a medal named for General Eisenhower, the leader of our "Crusade in Europe," a great soldier, and a great President. It is also a great honor because the VFW's two million members, standing shoulder to shoulder with our Armed Forces, epitomize patriotism, sacrifice, and all that's good about America. And so, this prestigious award from this great organization is a very special honor for me indeed.

But if Ike were here today, he would remind us that a General must only accept such an award in the name of the men and women under his charge. And so, with all humility, I accept this great honor on behalf of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines — active, guard, and reserve — who everyday lay it on the line for the greatest country in the world.

And for the next few minutes, I would like to tell you about your Armed Forces and those outstanding men and women who are its life's blood.

But let me start with a bit of recent history.

Since the end of the Cold War, we have been able to safely cut our forces by 700,000 people, about a third of the active force. How big is 700,000? The force we cut is more than all of the troops in the British, German, Dutch, and Danish armed forces put together. Or put another way, the force we cut is 200,000 people more than all of the autoworkers

in the United States. In terms of combat structure, we cut active Army divisions from 18 to 10; and Air Force tactical fighter wings from 36 to 20; and the number of ships in the Navy were reduced by nearly 40 percent.

The defense budget has gone down 40 percent, as well. And today we spend less of a percentage of our nation's wealth on defense than at any time since before the Second World War.

In the past, the deep cuts that followed every war have always meant a drastic downturn in the quality and the readiness of our forces. But this time, with sound leadership in the field, the support of the Congress, and the hard work of two different Administrations, we have successfully managed the huge post-Cold War drawdown, creating a smaller but, pound-for-pound, an even more capable force.

And it is a good thing that we did.

Today, as we are painfully aware, we live in a world traumatized by ethnic conflicts, failed states, and outbreaks of that rare but deadly virus, naked aggression. As a result, today's force has been one of the busiest in our peacetime history. In just the four years that I have been Chairman, our forces have conducted 50 different operations, some you hardly ever hear about, and others as well known as Bosnia.

I just returned from a trip to Bosnia a few days ago. Thanks to our 8,000 troops there, and the forces of our allies and partners, which include, by the way, a very effective Russian brigade, thanks to all of them, we have stopped the killing, which had made that country a living hell. And more importantly, today, because of our troops, there is relatively little risk that a war will break out in the Balkans.

And I'm sure all of you here tonight, especially you veterans of World War II, remember that for America, when it comes to wars in Europe, an ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure. By that standard, our force in Bosnia has been a great investment.

And let me pause here a moment to say thank you to the VFW for supporting our troops in Bosnia and the Middle East, especially with the phone cards that you provided as part of your "Operation Uplink." I cannot overstate how much they mean to the troops and to their families. Thank you all, very much.

But today Bosnia is just one of our key operations. Today, we are also in strength in the Persian Gulf, where we keep a powerful naval battle group, and in the skies over Iraq, where our valiant airmen enforce the U.N. sanctions against Saddam Hussein's regime and keep him from threatening his neighbors and the world's oil supply.

And just recently our Marines, God Bless 'em, have finished another major non-combatant evacuation in troubled West Africa.

We also have at all times about 100,000 personnel in the European theater and another 100,000 in the Pacific. And our friends and allies in those regions want our forces to stay for two key reasons. First and most obvious is our power.

Thanks in large measure to your sacrifice in years gone by, we are a global power with global interests to protect. And while we stay overseas to protect our interests, wherever we are, we are also a positive force for peace and stability. Our friends know that, our former adversaries know that, and the outlaw nations and the terrorists, who wish us ill, they know it too.

But the second reason that our friends and allies value our presence overseas is our men and women in uniform. When foreign generals come to the Pentagon to visit me, they speak with admiration of our equipment, but they are in awe of our people, especially our young NCOs.

And if you could come with me on my travels and see the professionalism of these young men and women, you would be extraordinarily proud. One look into their eyes makes you proud to be an American.

I have seen that look, just a few nights ago, in the eyes of the remarkable sailors on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, named aptly enough, the USS DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER. Not long ago, I saw it in the eyes of the young Marines, who had just rescued a downed pilot. And I have seen it, just this past week, in the compassion of Army National Guardsmen from the state of Georgia, who were repairing an orphanage in the far away Republic of Georgia in the former Soviet Union.

And it is no mystery what inspires, what sets apart our men and women in uniform. Along with their own professionalism and patriotism, it is your accomplishments, your example, and your legacy that inspire our men and women in uniform.

As President Clinton so aptly said, today's men and women in uniform are the sons and daughters of your sacrifice. They are what makes ours the best damned Armed Forces in the world, bar none!

But that said, it doesn't mean that everything in the Armed Forces today is perfect. It never was, and today is no exception. We have all read and heard about various problems — some acts of hazing, concerns over gender integration, and sexual misconduct.

The media loves these stories, and, in fact, for some weeks there, it was hard to tell the difference between news

stories about the Armed Forces and the network soap operas. Well, certainly these things are serious problems, but they are not epidemics.

But even though these social problems occur less in the military than in the civilian world, they are especially worrisome to our military. They destroy the dignity of the individual, damage morale, inhibit teamwork, and thus blunt our combat readiness. They are flat wrong, and we will not tolerate them.

We will continue to address each wrong speedily, openly, fairly, protecting the rights of the person wronged and those of the accused. But while we do that, we will get on with the job at hand, protecting American interests, wherever they might be challenged.

And that's why readiness is of equal concern to me. While our readiness in the near term is fine, we are beginning to see some early cracks, which if not fixed, could spell trouble. With a booming economy, enlistments are beginning to show signs of falling off and recruiting is becoming more difficult. Our men and women in uniform and their families are finding it more challenging to keep up with the demanding tempo of rigorous training, frequent deployments, and numerous on-going operations.

We have some good plans to right this situation, but readiness is one area where we will have to be especially watchful.

This past spring, we completed the Quadrennial Defense Review, an exhaustive study of the future and the kind of force that we will need in the challenging years ahead.

All indicators are, that for the next 10 to 15 years, our forces in the field are likely to face the same wide range of threats that they face today from terrorists, to rogue states equipped with weapons of mass destruction, to dangerous regional powers, like Iran, Iraq, and North Korea. Sometime beyond that, they may even face an emerging global power.

To deal with such a world, our Armed Forces must help shape the international environment by promoting regional stability, preventing conflicts, and deterring aggression in key regions of the world. But if we fail to prevent conflicts, we must then be ready, alone or with partners, to respond quickly, and to fight and win our nation's wars. And finally, we will have to prepare our forces to deal with the security challenges of an unpredictable future. And that means that tomorrow's force must have the new weapons and equipment that it will need to give it the qualitative edge on any future battlefield, against any future adversary.

All of this is a very tall order. And we know that we will need your help to get the job done.

First and foremost, we need the VFW to keep doing what it does so well: fighting for our veterans. Not long after the founding of the VFW, Teddy Roosevelt said that, "A man, who is good enough to shed his blood for his country, is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards." We must never settle for anything less.

Our young service members watch very carefully what is happening to retiree and veterans' benefits. If you want to keep good people in the military today it is important to give a "square deal" to those who served in the past.

Another way that the VFW can help the Armed Forces is in education.

Veterans are a wise but an aging breed. The median age of the World War II vets is nearly 75; the median age for Korean War vets is over 65; and those young whippersnappers of the Vietnam War era, their median age is over 50. In effect, our population is losing military experience and the wisdom that comes along with it. If we are to have the best decision-making possible, organizations like the VFW need to redouble their considerable efforts at educating the American people on national security issues.

And that brings me to a third area where we need your help. We need you to continue to speak out about the importance of military preparedness and the importance of a strong Armed Forces.

The VFW has been a very sane and influential voice on national security issues, to include, most recently, NATO enlargement and on our policy on land mines. But with our population of vets getting smaller, your voice must get louder.

Some of you out there have paid in blood for our lack of preparedness in the past. We can't let that happen ever again. And for tomorrow, the key to keeping our force well prepared is people, quality men and women, the resources to train them, and the experienced well-educated leaders to make them all that they can be. In the urge to save money, we can't balance the budget on the backs of our young men and women in uniform or on the backs of their families.

To remain strong, to remain the best military in the world, we need the continued help of veterans, the cooperation of the Congress, and the support of the American people. I know I can count on the VFW.

Ladies and gentlemen, our nation approaches the twenty-first century from a position of great strength. And we will never forget that it was you, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, who helped to make us the best and the strongest nation on earth.

Because of you, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, we stand on the threshold of the second American century. Thanks for a magnificent job.

And as for me, my time in uniform grows short. But in the months I have left, and in the years to come, I will look back on this day with great pride. I will remember it as a day, when standing here among old friends, that I could conclude my time as a soldier and begin my time as a proud veteran.

My fellow veterans, I salute you. Thank you for this great honor. May God Bless you, God Bless the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and God Bless this great country of ours.

**American Legion Annual Convention
Orlando, Florida
3 September 1997**

Let me tell you what a real pleasure it is to once again address this marvelous convention and to be here in Florida among so many friends and heroes. Of course my staff is constantly reminding me that after 39 years in the Army, it's probably great to be anywhere.

I must confess that I'm always just a little hesitant whenever I'm asked to speak to a large group of our outstanding veterans. Because according to the laws of probability, one of these days sitting in the audience there is going to be someone that knew me at basic training way back in 1958 and he's going to tell you all those embarrassing stories that I've managed to keep hidden for the last 39 years. And after hearing the stories, you'll all probably wonder how I ever made it beyond the rank of Private, let alone to the rank of General.

I just returned from a couple of weeks of leave getting my new home in order and I've got to tell you all a short story. As most of you know when you finally get away for a vacation it's real hard to get out of your normal everyday routine. So after a few days of just wandering around the house early in the morning, I started doing my exercise, then eating breakfast at a little pancake house just a few blocks away from our new retirement home. Every time I went in there, sitting in a booth was the same group of "locals" always watching me eat breakfast.

Finally after a few days one of them turned around in the booth and asked me if I was new in town. I told them that I was and had stayed in a house just down the road from this cafe. So he turned around to his friends and said, "I told you so." Then he looked at me real hard and said, "You're retiring aren't you?" And I told him yes and he turned back around to his buddies once more and with a big smile on his face told them, "See I told you so." Now his confidence was really up so he said, "I'll bet you're in the Army aren't you?" I said, "Yes," and once again he looked at his pals and said, "See, I'm right again!" Finally he asked me what rank I was and I said if I told you, you wouldn't believe me. And right away he turned to his buddies and said, "See I told you he was a sergeant major!"

I got quite a chuckle out of that little exchange. Because it was clear that my new neighbor thought a lot more of NCOs than he did of generals and if he only knew how good and how busy the average sergeant is today he would think even more of them.

Even as we gather here today at this grand convention, some 40,000 of our great men and women in uniform, some of them your sons and daughters or grandchildren, are deployed on 10 major operations around the globe. This is in addition to the 100,000 we have permanently deployed in Europe and the 100,000 forward deployed in various areas of the Pacific. And as you might expect they are performing superbly, continuing the high standards that men like Bob Dole, who the convention will honor later, and you our great veterans have set for them.

They are the best military in the world today bar none! There are none like them in the world and no other military force could have accomplished all that our men and women have done these past four years.

It is truly amazing to realize that just within the last 12 months our forces have participated in operations along the Peru-Ecuador border, guarded the no-fly zones over Iraq, intercepted clandestine shipping in the Arabian Gulf and the Mediterranean, evacuated non-combatants from four countries during crises, searched the jungles of Southeast Asia for fallen comrades, worked hard to stem the flow of drugs, stopped the killing of women and children in Bosnia, and for the 15th year participated in the observer mission in the Sinai cautiously watching the peace between Egypt and Israel.

And this has occurred even as we have been maintaining our very significant commitments in the rest of the world, in Korea, Japan, and as we build new partnerships in Central and Eastern Europe.

Throughout these busy times, perhaps the busiest in our peacetime history, the American Legion has been there shoulder to shoulder in body and spirit supporting our great forces. And I cannot overstate how much your support means to our troops and to their families. Thank you all so very much.

Let me assure you that like those of you who liberated Europe and rescued the nations of the Pacific, everywhere our forces go in the name of peace they are making a difference in the lives of those they touch.

I still remember as a young boy seeing you, the world's finest military, march into Europe and put an end to the bloodshed and devastation that had taken so many innocent lives and so many of my friends. You touched my life in a way you'll never fully realize and I stand here today as a tribute to your generosity, your caring, and your compassion.

So it should come as no surprise that our sons and daughters who wear the uniform continue in the grandest American tradition to make a difference in the lives of others as they continue their missions around the globe. From the starving refugees they helped feed in Rwanda, to the people plucked from rafts in the middle of the ocean desperately fleeing Castro's Cuba, to the nearly 2,000 foreign nationals from more than 60 countries rescued from Liberia in the midst of crisis, all, all have benefited from contact with our great forces.

And if you want to know just how much of an effect we have on those we help consider the case of Adisa Dubica, a young Muslim woman in Bosnia.

In August 1994, she along with her mother and 50 other Bosnian Muslims, were rounded-up in the middle of the night. They were forced to stand at the edge of trench that undoubtedly was intended to be their grave. It was reported that just as the men raised their guns a loud voice came from the trees that said, "Stop you are surrounded. Put down your arms. We're the United States Marines." The men did as they were told and out walked just two Marines who just happened to be walking by and who surely prevented a mass murder.

Adisa Dubica thanks America's Armed Forces for giving her back her life and her confidence, just as you all did in so many far away lands before, and she hopes that someday she too can make a difference. And she undoubtedly will have the chance, because today she is a private first class in the United States Marine Corps having recently completed training at Camp Lejeune.

When all is said and done, it's our people who are the backbone of our military excellence and it is your example, your patriotism, and your accomplishments that inspire them.

It is their capacity to meet the toughest challenges and to bring life and order and hope to millions of people who have no hope that helps make America great. That is why we must preserve the outstanding quality of men and women in our forces. This means providing them with fair pay, good housing, access to effective medical care, and all those other things that contribute to their "quality of life."

But equally important, we need to provide them with a working environment that allows each man and woman to grow and flourish and to reach their full potential as soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen.

We have all read and heard about the various problems — hazing, acts of undiscipline, concerns over gender integration, and sexual misconduct. The media loves these stories and in fact for some weeks there it was hard to tell the difference between news stories about the Armed Forces and the network soap operas.

Well, certainly these things are problems, serious problems, but they are not epidemics. But even though these social problems occur less in the military than in the civilian world, they are especially worrisome to our military. For they destroy the dignity of the individual, damage morale, inhibit teamwork, and thus blunt our combat readiness.

They are flat wrong and we will not tolerate them.

But for me, readiness is an equally serious concern. We are beginning to see some early indicators that, if not corrected, will adversely affect future readiness. With a booming economy, enlistments as well are beginning to show signs of falling off and recruiting is becoming more difficult. Our units in the field, and more to the point, our men and women in uniform and their families, are finding it more challenging to keep up with the demanding tempo of rigorous training, frequent deployments, and numerous on-going operations. In short, today's hard-working force is showing some signs of wear. We have some good plans to right this situation but this is one area where we will have to be especially vigilant in the future.

Recently, Comic strip philosophers Calvin and Hobbes also discussed the importance of looking out for the future. Calvin was talking to Hobbes and said, "You could step in the road tomorrow and WHAM! Get hit by a cement truck! That's why my motto is live for the moment." Then he turned to his pal and asked, "What's your motto?" Answered Hobbes, "My motto is look down the road."

The importance of "looking down the road" is why this past spring we completed the Quadrennial Defense Review, an exhaustive study of the future and the kind of force that we will need in the challenging years ahead.

All indications are that for the next 10 to 15 years, our forces in the field are likely to face a wide range of threats, from terrorists to rogue states equipped with weapons of mass destruction to potent regional powers. And sometime beyond we may even face an emerging global power. Thus our challenge is to prepare our forces to deal with these security challenges of a future that by all indications, will remain as unpredictable as it is today. Clearly that means that

tomorrow's force must have the new weapons and equipment that it will need to give it the qualitative edge on any future battlefield.

But we must also live up to the promises we make to those who gave faithful service to our nation. We cannot ask our people to dedicate their lives to the defense of this great nation and then turn "a blind eye" towards them after they leave. So equally aggressive must be our commitment to the educational, medical, and financial benefits promised to not only our active duty members, but to our retirees and all our great veterans of military service.

As Teddy Roosevelt once said, "A man who is good enough to shed his blood for his country is good enough to be given a square deal afterwards."

The American Legion has helped us so many times, like drafting one of the most successful government programs ever devised in the history of our nation, the GI Bill.

And now we need your help again for so many other worthwhile programs such as transition assistance for members leaving active duty, access to military medical care for veterans over 65, helping those taken ill as a result of Gulf War service, accounting for our POWs/MIAs, and ensuring Congress continues to support our existing retirement program and job hiring preferences for Veterans.

If America's armed forces are to continue to be the force of change, of peace, and of stability in the next century, truly there is much to be done. And it will take the efforts of the entire team: our active force, the reserves and guard, our outstanding DoD civilians, and most importantly, you our veterans who helped make us the best, the strongest nation on earth.

You have a story to tell and it must be told more often much louder and with greater vigor than ever before. Because today, from the halls of Congress to the streets of Orlando, Florida, fewer and fewer Americans share your experiences as veterans of military service and guardians of America's freedom. The median age of the World War II vets, I'm told, is nearly 75, the median age for Korean War vets is over 65, and those "young whippersnappers" of the Vietnam War era, their median age is over 50. In effect our population is losing military experience and the wisdom that comes along with it.

We need you now more than ever before to help us educate our youth and advise our citizens and civilian leaders so that they can make informed decisions on these very key issues.

I have been privileged to live in this nation during a very great period. I have watched our nation use its tremendous power and talents to wise and enormous effect.

From the day that I put on this uniform I have been proud to be a part of that effort and proud to have served with those of you in this audience.

Now as we stand on the threshold of a new century, a second American century, I am confident that for all we have accomplished this past fifty years we will accomplish even more in the next fifty.

Once again thank you for your support sacrifice and service to our great nation.

You can be extremely proud of what our men and women in uniform are accomplishing these days for our nation. I promise you that they will remain ferocious and insurmountable in war, extraordinarily noble in peace, and they will jealously guard your legacy.

God Bless you all and God Bless America.

Joint Forces Quarterly Magazine
"A Word from the Chairman"
General Shalikhshvili's CJCS Farewell
Autumn/Winter 1997

While packing for the last PCS move of my 39-year career, I rediscovered several earlier editions of Joint Force Quarterly on the shelves in my professional library. The Autumn 1993 issue caught my attention because it was the edition published on the eve of my assuming the position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The issue began appropriately enough with a farewell from my predecessor, General Colin Powell, who made an interesting but perhaps unnoticed comment. He challenged all of us to safely manage force reductions "... without losing the high quality that has become the hallmark of America's military." In retrospect, this challenge truly characterizes one of the major efforts of the past four years.

Thanks to the dedicated efforts of every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine our margin of superiority over potential foes is arguably greater than it has ever been.

With an operations tempo that included more than 40 major operations and Joint Task Force deployments during my tenure, leaders at every level, from the front line NCO to our most senior flag officer, ensured we remained focused on the mission and on our combat readiness.

But there is a pitfall in focusing so sharply on current events that we become distracted to the point where we do not put enough thought and energy into preparing for the potential dangers looming over the horizon. Concentrating all of our precious resources on handling near-term challenges results in the assumption of significant risk in the long-term; risk that could potentially place our men and women in greater danger during future conflict. So now a new challenge lies before us.

That challenge is to remain fully capable of over-matching any of today's potential adversaries, while at the same time channeling all of our enthusiasm, innovation, and sufficient resources into preparing for the future and ensuring America remains the world's finest fighting force.

Positioning ourselves for continued greatness in the 21st century is a complicated proposition that involves more than just purchasing new weapon systems. There are dimensions to the problem and the solution, requiring the thoughtful participation of professionals at all levels. Because the revolution in military affairs is not just about husbanding information age technologies, precision strike, and stealth. It is every bit as dependent on new organizational structures, new operational concepts, innovative approaches to old tactical problems, and the furtherance of joint teamwork.

The foundation for ensuring our ability to protect America's vital interests in the next century is now under construction. You see it being built day-by-day, brick-by-brick during every joint exercise, the publication of each new joint doctrine manual, and even during the often contentious, but productive inter-service debates on operational concepts. You are the architects and builders of our new military. As you continue this important project, never forget that America charges you with protecting this great democracy and that in your hands, it places the welfare of its sons and daughters and a legacy of excellence provided by millions of veterans.

I remain eternally grateful for your exceptional efforts and selfless dedication these past four years. Good luck in your careers and God bless you all.

**Farewell Ceremony at
Fort Myer, Virginia
30 September 1997**

What a great day to be a soldier despite these clouds!

Thank you, Secretary Cohen, and thank you, Mr. President for those very kind words. And thank you, Mr. President, for the award of the Medal of Freedom. I'm so deeply honored. And let me say as well, that it is a privilege to leave this office, knowing that I will be relieved by General Hugh Shelton, a friend, a combat veteran decorated for heroism, a true professional, and an inspired choice to lead our Armed Forces into the 21st Century.

And I thank you Mr. President, and I thank you too, Mr. Vice President, for all you have done these past four years to keep America's Armed Forces the very best in the world and for all your concern for the safety of our men and women, and their welfare, and the welfare of their families. Mr. President, it has been an honor to have served under your command.

A short while ago, I received a new set of orders, as I have so many times in the past. These orders, my retirement orders, contained a notation that reminded me that I have now served 39 years, 3 months, and 1 day on active duty. To some of you here, that must sound like a very, very long period of time. In my own life, if I were to measure the distance between my earliest memories of Warsaw, Poland, my birthplace, and this podium today, it might seem like a very long journey, indeed. But in truth, these 39 years have passed by in the wink of an eye.

For it seems like only yesterday that I, a brand new draftee from Peoria, Illinois, started my journey as a wide-eyed trainee in the green hills of Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri; only yesterday, that I felt the biting cold of the Alaskan winter, while serving as a brand new lieutenant with the Manchus of the 1st Battle Group, 9th Infantry; only yesterday, that I experienced the stifling afternoon heat of the rice paddies and the jungles of Vietnam; or that in Germany at Grafenwoehr, I heard the roar of the guns of the 1st Armored Division; or bathed in the dust at Yakima with the motorized soldiers of the 9th Division; and only yesterday, in the mountains of Northern Iraq, I watched with pride as American soldiers and soldiers from a dozen different nations worked feverishly to give life back to hundreds of thousands of Kurds, who had been driven into these mountains by Saddam Hussein and left there to perish.

These experiences seem like only yesterday because, in the history of our nation and our military, they are but a

fleeting moment, a moment replayed day in and day out, on a thousand posts, camps, and stations from Kuwait to Kansas, from Pearl Harbor to the Persian Gulf, to Germany, to Korea.

For a peacetime era, these past four years have been a period of unprecedented military activity and unmatched operational excellence. Each time the call came, America's forces were ready, and each time they performed magnificently

Whether maintaining a strong deterrent against aggression on the Korean peninsula; ensuring Saddam Hussein remembers the penalty for turning his fury against his neighbors or his own people; providing humanitarian assistance for the dying in Rwanda; bringing an end to violence in Haiti; or extending the hand of friendship to former adversaries and new partners through NATO's Partnership for Peace; our men and women did all that America asked of them, and more. And in the process, they proved themselves, to friend and foe alike, the best military in the world, bar none.

Others might envy us our high technology equipment, but they stand in awe of our young men and women in uniform and the sergeants and petty officers who lead them.

To paraphrase the late General Abrams, people aren't in the Armed Forces, people are the Armed Forces. Not "personnel," but living, breathing people, tough people, ethical people, trained people, people working together to get the job done, worldwide, year after year, not just for 39 years, but for over two centuries. Our men and women in uniform were always, are now, and forever will be, the key to our operational excellence, and no technology is about to change that.

We must never forget their sacrifice; we must never underestimate their importance; and we must never cut back on our support for them or their families.

And just as people are the lifeblood of our Armed Forces, so they have been the joy of my years in uniform. I have worked for and served with the best.

From Sergeant Grice, who taught me how to care for soldiers, to General Lester L. Wheeler, who instilled in me the essence of being an officer, through thousands of others, all the way up to my friend Colin Powell, who mentored me on the responsibilities of being a Chairman.

And while Chairman, I have been blessed to work for three great Secretaries: the late Les Aspin; Bill Perry; and now Bill Cohen; all men of character, men of brilliance, and men dedicated to building a strong defense. No one could ask for better bosses, or more dedicated Americans to look after our men and women in uniform. I thank you.

And I have been blessed, and indeed America has been blessed, to have the great generals and admirals that we have had leading the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marines, and the Coast Guard during these very turbulent years. Denny, Jay, Ed, Chuck, and Bob, I thank you for your support, your wise counsel, and for your friendship.

And we have been blessed, as well, to have had such outstanding leaders as our unified commanders. I can't say enough to praise all of you and the great work that you have done to give America a joint force equal to her own greatness.

And to the Vice Chairman, General Joe Ralston, my dear friend, you are a consummate professional, and a model of selfless service. Every honor that I received today owes much to your wisdom, your tireless work, and your devotion to our nation.

And to the Joint Staff, you lead the way. You are the finest military staff, and much of our operational excellence springs from your unmatched professionalism.

But when all is said and done, it is my family to whom I owe the greatest debt of gratitude.

Joannie, these 30 years together have been a most wonderful journey, with you and I holding hands, every step of the way. How lucky I am to be married to my best friend, who shares my love for soldiers, and who has given so much to them and to their families. Joannie, we always said that together we could make it, for that's the kind of stuff we're made of. Well, Duck, we've made it. I love you.

And thank you Brant, for having put up with all of my absences from home while you were growing up, all the many moves, all the missed soccer games, and despite that, having become the fine young man that you are. Your mother and I are prouder of you than you will ever know.

Forty-five years ago, my parents, my brother Othar, my sister Gale, and I came to the shores of this great nation, and America took us in and opened its heart to us. In time, it allowed me to rise from private to Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What a reflection on this grand land of opportunity! Only, only in America!

Now, let me close with a word to the soldiers with whom I shared this 39-year journey.

Many years ago, when he was asked what his last wish would be, Black Jack Pershing said that, "When the last bugle is sounded, I want to stand with my soldiers." When years hence, the last bugle sounds, I hope I stand with you as ramrod-straight and as proud, as you stand before us here today.

In the years to come, no matter what I do, no matter where I go, no matter what I will become, in my heart, I pray,

I will always remain one of you, a soldier.

Mr. President, it has been a great honor to wear the uniform of this great nation and to serve you. I thank you for that privilege.

May God Bless you, sir, and may God Bless this extraordinary land of ours.