

MAJOR GENERAL DARREN MCDEW: First of all, beyond just standing here--that alone scares me to death--was just the idea that Dr. Ehrhard said I would present my own views. If you're a two star on the Joint Staff and someone says you're going to go to a conference full of these distinguished panel members and present your own personal views, that would scare the crap out of you. And if it doesn't, it should. [laughter] Chief, four stars, distinguished audience members, I will admit to you, I am extremely nervous. And, I don't get nervous very often, but I'm nervous standing up here because if you've read anything about national security, you've read about these gentlemen on the panel. There's an empty seat right now between them, for the guy you probably haven't heard about when you talk about national security, me. So I stand up here a bit awed by my panel members, and I'm grateful to be standing here.

I am going to present a couple things being bantered around on the Joint Staff in the strategic plans and policy arena, things that you've probably heard and read about, but would be, I think, a good lens through which to view the rest of this discussion. [First slide] First of all, we will agree that today's strategic environment is, in fact, uncertain and definitely complex. As the world becomes more integrated, the security challenges we face grow larger and not smaller. Our nation faces a broad array of challenges that call for cooperation and common interest. We must seize upon the unprecedented interconnectedness of the 21st century to help take advantage of opportunities as they arise. At the same time, we will need to use all elements of power in concert with our allies and partners to defend America, our allies and our national security interests. The U.S. military will be provocative in preventing war through deterrence and cooperation with our allies and partners while maintaining a decisive joint force ready to fight and win.

[Second slide] I had to put something like this up here. What I want to show you is the world, how it used to be when many of us--and I can look around and scan the ages in the crowd--for many of us the world we grew up in was pretty simple. We didn't think so at the time, but looking back on it, it was fairly simple. After World War II, America literally stepped through the looking glass. The U.S. found itself adversaries with a

wartime ally, the Soviet Union. The United Kingdom gave way to the U.S. as the dominant western power and the global landscape was now defined in terms of democracy and totalitarianism.

For all the changes in the world, the world order still very much followed the Westphalian model. With the end of the Cold War in 1991, the United States of America became the most powerful nation on the planet and one of the most powerful nations in human history. The collapse of the Soviet Union set off a massive shift in the tectonic plates of international politics. If you look on the left-hand side of this slide, and I was hoping to show you on the other side, which is the difference between the way I grew up and the way my daughter grew up. Let's try the next slide, please, and see if it comes up. What it shows you is many of you remember those rooms full of computers and remember typing keypunch cards. And, do you remember the size of that cell phone the guy is carrying? And, the world was looked at in terms of blue and red, black and white, good and bad. Fast forward to today, it is much more dynamic. However, if you look in the center picture up there, that's an iPhone. And probably the way I'd use it, which is to make it look like a dial phone so that it's more familiar to me.

As I dealt with my daughter growing up, many times I would say, "Stop doing that," as she was listening to the radio, watching television, texting someone, IMing someone, and working on her homework. What it meant to me was I was not comfortable with what she was doing, and I couldn't handle it. Not that she couldn't. The big change that has happened in the world is the difference between the way we grew up, what we thought we could handle, the way we saw the world and now the way our children are growing up and the way they see the world and what they can handle.

[Slide 3] The post Cold War fog is clearing. Russia and Georgia (in reference to the conflict last year) is perhaps the last bit of fog, or beginning of a new, and the end of ideology. But, it is the beginning of a smaller, flatter and more troubled world. A diverse set of security challenges are arising in the 21st century, amplified by adverse demographic trends and increasing urbanization. Those listed here are are a concern

for all nations, or at least they should be, and cannot be solved alone. Therefore, we must address them with all our allies and partners. You see on the slide here a conglomeration of “stuff”. These challenges are the “stuff” we deal with on a daily basis in the Joint Staff and you react to on a regular basis. I could go into great detail about any one of them, and so could you, but we won’t right now. We face a complex blend of partners and competitors--who are not necessarily destined to be our adversaries--and interests, many of which are shared and can be exploited.

[Slide 4] This is the “what keeps me up at night” slide. You may not be interested in what and why I lose sleep, only that you should be interested because what we in the J5 lose sleep over are the things the Chairman and the Joint Chiefs are concerned about. So, they should be of concern to all of you. Nothing on the slide you haven’t heard before. Down the center is the way we think we will deal with it. You may see these terms again, the 5Ps [Partner, Prepare, Prevent, Preserve, Prevail]..

[Slide 5] This slide depicts a potential breeding ground for instability. You can see how large it’s getting. One lens through which to view this slide is to look at the failed and/or failing states, and all of the folks in this world do not necessarily fit in that category. Then you look at some ungoverned territory, and what you have is a breeding ground for instability. In many circumstances today, that’s what you have. You’re constantly shifting from one case of failed and/or failing ungoverned space, instability, to another.

[Slide 6] Piracy is a great example that was borne out of this breeding ground for instability. Some see it as kind of a waterborne problem. It’s not, it’s a land borne issue that will eventually have to be dealt with on the land and not on the water. But, we have a few good successes with the nations that are coming together to combat this particular problem. Nevertheless, we are inundated with a variety of concerns such as piracy, pandemics, international crime, trafficking in humans, weapons and narcotics and we’re going to need persistent engagement by a joint force and a combined force of allies and partners to deal with this global problem. We have to secure the global

commons. We must assure flow security, and there are a whole host of other issues where we'll need partnerships going forward to deal with.

[Slide 7] We talk a lot about whole of government, whole of society in fixing problems. There are a number of elements to that, also. I just spoke to a group of ALS students down at Shaw Air Force Base and I told them one of the things they should be buoyed by is the fact that they're the most dependable, powerful tool in our nation's toolkit. That is heartening and disheartening at the same time. Many of us would like to see another tool in the kit be as powerful and as dependable. You can see the whole of society thing. We need to get our arms around what does it mean to work whole of society issues as well as whole of government.

[Slide 8] We are spending a lot of time working on building partnership capacity. If you go back to what I talked about before with failed and/or failing states, the ungoverned spaces and potential breeding ground for instability, how do you get there before it becomes a problem for you and you have to pull out that most dependable tool you have in your toolkit, the U.S. military? There are some of us that believe you can do preventative maintenance, engagement, build partnership capacity in areas others may be weak so you don't have to use the military might as often as we do today. We will never get around the fact that we must remain prepared for those eventualities; however, could we be the second choice versus the first choice in many cases?

[Slide 9] These are examples of strategic partnerships to develop cooperative security. The combatant commanders have used one authority, 1206, as the most important program to rapidly address threats and opportunities in their theater. State Department ambassadors also speak very highly of it. It is considered the gold standard of security assistance programs. It goes to the building partnership capacity issue again. It is critical to reducing the military risk on a preventative basis. 1206 funding flexibility allows us to meet urgent and emergent threats or opportunities. I am confident our partner capacity building efforts are moving in the right direction, but still need plenty of work and focus for a lot more folks than just us on the Joint Staff. It's getting there.

AUDIENCE: Yes, sir. Colonel J. D. Klemm from SAF/AQQ. This is not a stuff question. When we discuss balance and force mix, what is the thinking reference the ARC? Should it mirror the active? Specifically, as resources become tighter, can we afford to equip the ARC as stand alone force projection outfits when the maximum and during deployment posture is only 1:4 or 1:5? Should we instead focus the ARC on different missions as we are with remotely piloted vehicles such as nuclear security, homeland defense or cyber?

DR. EHRHARD: Does anyone want to take that one?

MR. THOMAS: Yes. We could elaborate on it, but I think your comment, question, gets to the heart of it. And as we move to the future where we have greater and greater constraints on our personnel, we ought to incorporate our reserve component in an optimum fashion where the mission sets make sense. And those that require less deployment are a perfect fit for the ARC in some of the missions that you mentioned. And that we're jumping in with two feet to do that. But the Director of the Air National Guard was in my office the other day and we were talking about greater incorporation of Air National Guard folks doing the remotely piloted aircraft mission, as well as the distributed common ground station analytic back end piece. A perfect match that will truly take us to the next level of total force integration.

DR. EHRHARD: Thanks, sir. Another question? Go ahead.

AUDIENCE: Sky Forrester from the Eisenhower Center of Space and Defense Studies at the Air Force Academy. Couple of references to commercialization, particularly as it relates to space. The reality is, as you all know, a substantial percentage of our capability, information flows, communications, comes from non-U.S. government assets in space, commercialization. To what extent is the commercial sector part of this consideration of what our own space assets ought to be, or are we still predominantly thinking about DOD and Air Force space assets and kind of leaving that to fend for itself? The thousand ship Navy is a bad metaphor, but there may be something-- there's

some element of that that might be interesting to pursue. I'd be interested in your comments.

DR. EHRHARD: I can say the space posture review is another one of the reviews that we're sort of waiting to come out. But I do know they've addressed that and we don't really have the right people up here, perhaps, to deal directly with that question. But it always has been a part of how we think about space and the difficulty is that it changes over time. For a while there, it looked like there wasn't going to be a lot of capacity in space toward the end of the '90s. Some of the systems, Iridium, et cetera, were not very successful. So it makes it a very difficult planning challenge to understand just how much capacity is going to be out there. Now we see private, commercial companies getting into even some pretty high fidelity imagery-type work. So there can be no question that just like in aviation, air power is a larger part of both military and commercial and civil. The same thing applies to space.

I will just say this. Once again, when you start talking about force mix, you have to ask in an era of such constrained resources and the different kinds of challenges that all the speakers talked about here, you have to ask yourself, what is your core capability? What are really the things that you have to have in the U.S. military? And some of the challenges that were talking about here are not easy ones. They have to do with the fact that there's going to be growing challenges to unfettered access and exploitation of space. So there is no doubt about the fact that this, it's changing rapidly, what the composition of those space assets are. But we have to ask serious questions about when you fall back and you're dealing with a bandwidth constrained environment, for instance. What are those pieces that we have to have as military assets up there that do specific jobs for us and going forward the space mix?

Let me just add one other challenge to that. General Deptula deals with ISR every day. And there are huge issues dealing with the space and air mix, as well, and how we hedge against a future, more contested environment in both domains and how we balance those two capabilities. So there's no question about the fact that commercial

assets are being used today. They're a critical part of all those predator caps and reper caps that we're running every day, those commercial bandwidth paths. And so they've just become a part of the way we do business, and I don't think that's going to change in the near future.

I want to get off the stage now, we have Secretary Carter, is going to be speaking to you in a minute. I want to thank the speakers again for their words today, and hope we gave you something to think about when it comes to the future force mix for the Air Force. Thank you very much.

END OF SESSION III