

**REMARKS BY
ADM. MIKE MULLEN
CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF**

**AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE,
MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, MONTGOMERY, ALA.**

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2008

ADMIRAL MIKE MULLEN: Good morning. Carry on, please. Good morning.

ADM. MULLEN: It is a real treat for me to be here with you this morning. I've got, I understand, about two or three hours with you. I'll start out – I'd like to talk for a few minutes and then open it up to questions. The hour we have in questions, first of all, I get to learn a lot about you when you ask a question. Secondly, if I don't know the answer to the question I've got some of my staff here who will give me a card. If you can put your name and email address down I'll get an answer to you – better answer than the one I give you now. And I actually read my own email and I answer my own email, so I'd encourage you to do that.

First of all, I'd like to just say thanks for what you do, and you serve in an extraordinary time and, notionally, by your pay grade and seniority, you came in at an extraordinary time for our country. And so many of us are involved in a day-to-day – sometimes we don't step back and look at the time history in which we're involved, and we're writing a lot of history and you're doing that. And it's being done because you raised your right hand and you decided to serve your country and you are making an unbelievable difference.

Today, as I look around the audience, I'm told there are representatives from some 60-plus countries here, and so these remarks just don't – they're not intended just to those who serve in the U.S. military, because I believe this around the world, and I believe that coalition and the friendships and the partnerships are incredibly important for not just the world we're living in now, but the world that, as it will continue to evolve, and the world in which you'll lead militaries all over the world, and certainly the military here in the United States.

So I commend you for that. It's a huge challenge. I'm very comfortable knowing that I have the privilege of leading in a time where in particular – I mean, all our services – this is the best military I've ever been associated with, and I've been doing this since 19... It's a long time. It's a long time. And some of you should know – I mean, we're all influenced by our youth, and what influences me is when I came in. I came in as the Vietnam War was peaking. I was, you

know, deployed there my first war, returned to a country in great turmoil, and to a military that was not supported by the American people. And so there's not a day that goes by that I don't remember that, think about that as we continue to press very hard in these two conflicts that – these two wars we're in now and the pressure that it has brought on individual members and families and our military in general. And I look at that and I look to that as a measure of the strength of our force.

I have been, quite frankly, more than just taken back by the resilience in our force, and I don't think there's any question that our ground forces have been pressed harder than anybody else – certainly the Army and the Marine Corps – but that doesn't mean that our Air Force and our Navy, and quite frankly our Coast Guard, haven't been pressed as well. The op-tempo has been up for over a half a decade now, and I don't see a lot of reduction with respect to that. But that experience when I was young – and I still remember that, as long ago as it was – that experience moved me. It's seared in my brain in terms of how I look at the things that we do right now to make sure we never go back to that experience. And I don't think we're close to it, but it is something that I am very mindful of as we continue to press on.

So, thanks to you for what you're doing. Also I would be remiss if I didn't say you couldn't do it without your families, and both Deb and I are incredibly grateful for the service and support and sacrifice of our families. We've been doing this a long time. Family support has always been critical, never more so than now, and it's never been better. And for me, I mean, it was a single, very vivid set of events that surrounded families right after 9/11 that really brought this to the fore that families were going to be in on this, and families have, and they really have taken – they've really made an awful lot of what we do possible.

So I would ask – this is usually a failed communications circuit, meaning please pass this word when you get home to your families. I haven't done very well with that historically. Usually if I wanted to communicate with families it wasn't through members but I would ask if you remember that, you know, please pass my respects and regards to your families. And we have lots of challenges with our families right now, and I'll talk a little bit about that later on, and certainly happy to answer questions about it. We have lots and lots of challenges. I mean, specifically as I benchmark the services and support for families, quite frankly the Air Force does it better than anybody else. That's my view right now, and I look for one of the other services to take that away. That doesn't mean that the Air Force does it all exactly right and you don't have challenges, but that's the benchmark that I have out there, and I think it's critical.

As I have seen – as I've looked at the pressures and seen the issues that continue to challenge us, so many of them boil down to issues that basically weigh heavily in a decision whether a young man or woman decides to stay in the military. So many of them are retention issues that oftentimes we don't consider retention issues but they really are: where you live, how you live, how many times we move you, how are the schools, what are the kids going through? It's what I call the overall compensation package, not just sometimes what we focus on, and sometimes too often just the financial aspect of it, which is obviously critical. But it's the wholeness of that that is part of the promise we make to young people when we ask them to come in and serve – recruit them, ask them to do so much and sacrifice so much, and making sure we have that right.

So I am – and I spend an awful lot of time on family issues myself. My wife does it a whole lot more than I do, and I assure you she brings it to my attention routinely. She meets with an awful lot of spouses, and spouses have a way of getting the quick very rapidly – on what the issues are. So I'm able to see that and input that into the system. We've made progress. I think we still have a long way to go. So thanks a lot for what you're doing and thanks to your families.

Secondly, we live in a time of enormous change, and it will continue to change, and you, by virtue of your seniority, are at the heart of that change. You are expected to adapt to change, to lead change, and it's across the full spectrum of everything we're doing. I can focus on the operations that we're doing operationally and tactically. I can focus on the weapons systems that we have. I can focus on the – and would have very heavily focused on the need to continue to evolve jointly. That has changed dramatically since these wars started in 2001, 2002, 2003, and we will continue to change.

I visited Nellis a few months ago, and one of the things I was really heartened by out at Nellis was the fact that at the Air Warfare Center there, the lessons learned part of what's going on out there has reduced the lessons learned from learning them in theater; in fact, turning them rapidly enough into doctrine so it's almost the next squadron's deployment. The same is true in the Army where I visited a command center up in – battle command center in Fort Lewis, Washington, where the lessons learned, which took five and six years to get into doctrine, get incorporated, are now incorporated in less than a year – in about a year's time.

So that is all indicative of the kind of change that's going on. The curriculum I assume – I haven't been through it here, but I assume the curriculum is different now than it was even last year and continues to evolve. And I know that it was just recently reviewed and gets high marks from the accreditation group, if you will, for the change it's incorporated over the last year. But the change – when I'm talking about leading in a time of change, and the change, it's across everything we do. It's across how we – I believe how we are going to select people – officer, enlisted – how we're going to promote them, how we're going to recruit them, how we're going to retain them, the career paths.

No greater evidence of career path change is going on anywhere I don't think right now than in the Air Force when you look at the requirements we have to fly unmanned vehicles, and the requirements that we see. I'd be glad to talk about that if you want to, and that's hard stuff, particularly if you wanted to fly a jet, and now all of a sudden your career path gets vectored into sitting behind a console, which on the one hand you can say, this isn't what I signed up to do and it doesn't move very far. Two, you know, and in that mission, quite frankly, executing as critical a part of a mission in the war-fight that we've got right now, and in what I would call a growing and booming requirement for ISR and all that means.

And so we look out – and I heard General Schwartz say the other day that in a few years outside pointy-nose jets, the largest number of rated pilots in the Air Force are going to be flying unmanned aerial vehicles. Now, you may not like that, but I'm telling you, that's a vital mission and we are going there. And we've got to figure out – and I've done this in Navy. When we'd

shifted out of one kind of time model series and we decommissioned time model series, and it can be – it's got to be very well-led. What is the commitment – it has to be very visible and understood we're going there. And two is we've got to make sure we take care of our people in that regard, and that's tough, and it's tough at your pay grade, and not only is it tough at your pay grade; it's going to be tough as you leave. So as you go into command, you're going to have a lot of young officers wondering – they're going to ask you questions a thousand different ways about their future.

And how do we handle this? What's the plan? And there's some uncertainty associated with that, but at the very high level of the senior level, the commitment to make sure that we do this as well as we can, that we are very clear and open and objective, if you will, that we're going there in this very vital mission. And I didn't come here to talk a lot about that, but I want – that's an incredibly important part about change that we're in. But I see it in technology, I see it in people, I see it in missions, I see it in the joint world, I see it in the coalition world. I see it spanning the full spectrum of what we're required to do right now, whether it's peacetime deterrence – the significant overlap between what I see as irregular warfare and conventional warfare.

It is warfare, and many of the principles are the same, though in execution some of it is different. I see it in the precision that exists right now and that will continue to evolve over time. So that constant focus on change. And it is affecting you; it affects all your people that are working for you and will continue to do that for as far as I can see in the future. Actually, it is the enemy that we need to think about big changes, and it is the enemy who changes rapidly that we must in fact change more rapidly. We have closed the gap – those of you who have certainly been in theater, and I would assume that is most of you – we have dramatically closed the gap in the IED world. In 2004 we were a far second in that war.

I was in a meeting in 2004 in Baghdad where an explosives guy from the U.K. said that the enemy, they're changing tactics on the back of a napkin over a cup of coffee at a café while we were mailing it all in, trying to figure it out, and mailing it back to the United States trying to figure it out, and then sending it back. We were months down the road to adjustment. And it is the speed of that, and we are not months; we are adapting more quickly than that now. But we don't have to just match the speed of war; we've got to in fact get out in front on the speed of war, and that's another change which continues to face us.

Clearly – there hasn't been a meeting that I've been to or a discussion I've had in the last month that someone hasn't asked me, you know, how the financial crisis around the globe is going to affect the Department of Defense, and I don't think there's any question that it will and that it will change how we look to the future in some ways. I've been doing this and have also been doing money over the course of my career, and we do go through cycles here and we've had an up-cycle for a significant period of time. We should all be – without predicting because I can't, but certainly I don't – and you probably know there's an election in our country here – in the next – I think it's a week from today. I think that financial crisis will affect us no matter who becomes president. Ops – I'm talking about the Department of Defense.

I was struck the other night at a – I was at a dinner and I met two businessmen who were very, very senior individuals in very successful businesses, and both of them independently said how their bosses were already all over them to reduce costs because that is their, quote, unquote, “bottom line.” Now, our bottom line isn’t profit; it isn’t cost. Our bottom line is the defense that we provide this country. But we need to be mindful of spending that money well, making sure every single dollar that we have goes to the right place, and understanding that with respect to how we look to the future.

What struck me about that conversation is here are people in business already reining in, and we have not reined in yet. We are not saying that with respect to the finances that we have. So in fact I worry sometimes that, you know, when that sort of like the end of the fiscal year crunch comes, you know you can’t keep any money after the 30th of September so we make some purchases sometimes that are made in speed, and if we were stepping back from that they probably aren’t the – some of those certainly, expenditures, wouldn’t be the wisest in the world. I just use that as an example of some of the controls that we have on us.

So the financial piece is coming and there’s going to be change with that. I’m not here to say exactly how that comes out because I honestly don’t know, and I think we’ve got to have, clearly – and it’s my responsibility to articulate the – to understand what the strategy is for the United States for national security and to articulate the needs that we have to support that, from a resource standpoint, which includes sort of three big pieces: operations, people, and the systems that we need to support that. So I think there’s clearly a lot of work that we are looking to in the immediate, near-term, and mid-term future with respect to that.

So lots of change across an awful lot of what we’re doing. And I would – you are being in school this year, and I look at a very well-rested audience – – spending time with your families, taking leave, studying – I didn’t say this in priority order, but, you know, doing the work, establishing long-term relationships here across the joint force as well as coalition forces. I have said for many years – I said it in the Navy – if you want to go do a joint tour, go to Maxwell or go to Carlisle or go to Leavenworth. You’re going to make friends for life and you will meet each other again. It’s almost as joint as you can possibly get. And I see this in our force and I see it around the world routinely.

So you are here. And the other thing that you get to do over the course of this – how long a course is it, 18 months? Oh, we haven’t told you yet. But over the course of these studies, you know, because you are rested and stimulated, and I oftentimes wonder what happens to the great thought that happens in Montgomery, Alabama over the course of 12 months? What do we do with that? And I would charge General Peck and others to grab these ideas. I stood at Carlisle at graduation not too long ago and the first 30 students I met had put together the best thesis papers, or seminar papers, whatever they were, and I wondered what happened to those. Do they just go up on a shelf or do we actually take these great ideas? And you, because of your age and seniority, have a just whole lot of terrific, terrific ideas that we ought to be able to integrate into the system and be part of the change that I’m talking about.

So lots of change in lots of different areas, and that’s going to continue. And if it is while you’re here – there are lot of books on leading change. The one that I like the best because it’s

relatively simple is Kotter's book, which is called "Leading Change," which sort of talks about how you need to get at that. I think he's got 10 principles or 10 steps to take, and it's tough stuff because change is very unsettling. We can't – in the world we're in we cannot stay at the status quo. It just won't work. And so you have to execute it because your bosses are, and you also have to lead it because of the people that are in your charge no matter where you are.

Lastly I'd talk a little bit about – I want to talk about leadership because in the end that's what I pay you for. More than anything else, as technically qualified as you are, as good as you are in a certain area, in the end what I'm paying you for is to lead. My expectations are very high. Part of the reason I lean so hard on leadership is because in the toughest of times I was trained by great leaders who stepped up when there did not seem to be any answers. And I have been convinced over the course of my career – and this is not just you; this is leaders from E-1 through as senior as you can get – in extraordinary circumstances, young men and women have stepped up and made such a huge difference. That's happening now. You've done that. You know that. There is no more important characteristic of who we are than leadership. And that is across – again, not unlike change – the full spectrum of our requirements.

You are – given your seniority at this point, you'll have some opportunity here to start looking outside of where you grew up, outside of your set of skills, exposed to other militaries from other countries, certainly other services from our own country, and how the work. And I can't say in the next, you know, 10 to 15 years how much more important all that's going to be. So absorbing as much of that as you can, finding out why services are different – and indeed they are; I see it every day – and there is terrific strength in the differences and yet there are also weaknesses. And I would extend that as I look around to see the civilians in the audience – you know, the next big step for us is an interagency as healthy as our joint force.

I was with a young lady down in Key West a few months ago who as a liaison officer – I'm sorry, who 10 years ago had been a liaison officer from another agency in the drug war. And she recently had been assigned again down South to the staff down South. And a lot of us have grown up through liaison officers, trying to figure out what's going on, on a KOP or what's going on, on a carrier or what's going on in a command center in the field, whatever it is, but with a liaison officer you're still working for the head shed back home. When you're assigned to someplace, you're working for that commander. And she looked at me and she said, man, did we waste 10 years, because she had been basically responding back home.

So it is that how do you – how do you assimilate and how do you become part of another organization, and we do it pretty well in other services right now, certainly from the joint perspective. We've got an awful lot to learn about other agencies. So if I take half of you – roughly half of you when you graduate are going to go into operational tours, and if I picked one of you and said, okay, your next assignment to an operational tour is to the Treasury Department, raise your hand. What are you thinking? It's over. Right?

I have sat at meetings for the last year and been stunned at what the Treasury Department can do to help us from a security standpoint. Stunned. And we've got to figure out – and I can pick Commerce – actually, if you've been to Afghanistan, the agricultural world – you know, the agricultural department's got all those things, but if I pick you to go do that, you go home that

evening and you do send this message to your family that, you know, my career, as I understand it, or understood it, is over. Now, that is up to us in leadership to make sure, one, you pick the right individuals, and, two, that that doesn't happen. And we're not very good at that. None of the services are very good at that. And this is in the category of what I call, you know, ducks picking ducks, that if I did this it's good for somebody else, and therefore I'll pick someone just like me, and that doesn't broaden us very rapidly at all.

And we are on the verge of now – don't – I don't want the headlines this morning to say, he came down here; I'm going to the Treasury Department. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is that we – the best way to become integrated and interdependent is to assign our best people to those agencies. It's also – when we assign our best people, quite frankly, they're the ones that can survive the change better than anybody else. Their records can. And we need to think about how to do that, but what does it mean and how do we expose ourselves in that regard in terms of the interagency requirements that we have?

The fact of the matter is – and we can ponder the fact that one department doesn't have enough of whatever they are – agricultural specialists – who will deploy for six months or 12 months at a time when they didn't have a clue that that requirement was ever going to exist in the agricultural department in their career path, et cetera. But right now the capacity just isn't there and we're going to do some of this for the next decade or two, as I believe our government transitions to a much more expeditionary type requirement that we have right now.

I mean, because this is dominantly an Air Force audience here, if I go back seven or eight years and told you you'd have been leading PRTs in Afghanistan and in Iraq and doing the in-lieu-of jobs or the individual augmentation jobs that you're doing and that the Navy is doing, absolutely mandatory as far as I'm concerned. No, and we would never have predicted we'd be where we are, and yet those jobs and what you've done and how you've done it are as vital as any jobs that we've got in the force right now.

And one of the reasons they're so vital is because of what I talked about earlier. When we put so much pressure on the ground force, the ground forces get to a point where they just can't sustain themselves. So every individual going to assist in the ground campaign is one less individual in the ground world that adds to the pressure. Until we get to be big enough and the operations get to be scuttled low enough where we can back off of that, and I don't see that, anyway for the next two or three years.

So what you've done and what in particular the Air Force has done in that regard has been truly – and it hasn't been alone because other services have done it as well – truly been extraordinary. And that has taken leadership, and we need to make sure that individuals who do that, go away to the Treasury Department or whatever it is, that they actually come home at some point in time and they come home with a vibrant future.

So leading – I mean, leading our young people in a great time of question in terms of the pressures that are out there, the pace of deployments, certainly leading right now are the Air Force. The Air Force has been through a pretty tough year – I'm happy to talk about that – with the leadership change-out with Secretary Wynne and Chief of Staff Moseley, with the focus in

particular of that of the erosion of the nuclear mission. And it has eroded over time and it has gone back as far as 10 to 15 to 20 years that that erosion started. So my expectation is that's not going to be fixed overnight, and yet it must be fixed. No more important mission is there for us as a country, and this is a zero-defects mission, clearly. I mean, I grew up in that business, I understand it, and it is – it must be zero defects.

And the other piece of that whole discussion – and I hope actually in the time you're here you really do chew on this and have some healthy debates and discussions about it – is the whole issue of accountability. It's how I grew up, it's why I stayed in, it's why I love command. And there isn't anybody at any level of seniority that wouldn't tell you, you know, that their worst day in command was better than any other day they had anywhere else, and that their worst day in command, some days, you know, there was a hand that reached in to save their careers and they got lucky.

That said, we are accountable for our commands at every level, and that message is very important. That's a very important message right back to – and I'll speak specifically to the chiefs' position, and having been a chief of a service, I do understand that. And when you lose that accountability, when accountable officers don't step forward and say, it's my command, okay, and my command – in Navy terminology – is aground, and when you are aground, you know, you walk off the brow. That's the rule. We know that. So the accountability aspect of all that is also really important. I think General Schwartz has got the right focus. He and I have talked about this.

But it's not going to be just General Schwartz; it's going to be all of us. It's going to be everybody. And to look back to the best Air Force that we've ever had and the best Air Force in the history of the world, we know that. I believe that. And, yes, there have been some problems. We cannot just sit and ponder those; we have to move forward in this world that challenges us; the challenges in the wars we're in, the challenges to prevent future wars. That requires the full spectrum of capability including every aspect of who we are as a military, from the counterinsurgency piece, to the conventional warfare piece, to what goes on, you know, in the air to be able to threaten and hold at risk targets around the world, which is what we have to do, and that we have a balanced force in that regard.

So you are really tasked right now with understanding a lot about this. You have a year to kind of think about it and chew on it, where you personally – and then you will – you know, the vast majority of you will go out and lead people very quickly, and how are you going to talk about that? And where do you take this? You know, at the '04 level – '04 and '05 level you will be, many of you, going into the command structure and you'll be expected to have those answers and make a difference. And the chief can do all he wants, but it isn't going to be anywhere close to enough if his commanders aren't doing that kind of work.

So, I mean, I would focus on that aspect of leadership, and at the heart of everything we're doing, we're going to come up – you know, there may be questions about certain weapons systems and even certain bases about the future. Above all else, we need to make sure our people are in good shape because if our people are in good shape – we've got right now the most combat-hardened military in the history of our country, and I believe our future is guaranteed if

we figure out a way to keep a hold, to keep these young people in, in every service. And I'll focus on O-3s and E-5s and 6s, but if we can keep them in and keep that core, I believe a very healthy future for our military is guaranteed. And flip that over, obviously.

So we should, above all else, make sure we get it right for our people, and all that means – and that's not just individuals obviously. As I said earlier, that's also for our families. Otherwise our best young people will walk. And they're not right now. I don't see that. The recruiting numbers are good. The retention numbers are good. How many have been a recruiter? Why is that, when I get to an audience like this and there's usually one recruiter? It's tough to – we can't go anywhere without great recruiters and great results. It's where it all starts.

So, I mean, the recruiting is exceptionally – it's demanding but we're actually doing pretty well right now. I mean, we've got some problems. There's no question. Probably the biggest pressure clearly is on the Army, although this last year I was glad to see the Army – their concern about waivers and high school graduates – actually the number of high school – the percent of high school graduates, which was 79 percent in '07, is now up in the – I think it's in the low – the last number I saw was 83 percent. So the trend is in the right direction, and there are some expectations that I have – and we're starting to see this in some of the numbers – obviously when the economy gets tough, usually that gives the military a boost, but we should not rest of that, believe me. I know that – I don't take great comfort in that because the recruiting work still is absolutely vital.

So, believe me, taking care of our people – and in particular we are – because of the pressure that we're under across the board, how are we as leaders reaching out to touch that pressure? How do we know what's going on in a family? How do we know – how do we make sure that the things that really hurt us in the workplace or off the workplace – sexual harassment, sexual assault – at the heart of so much of the trouble that we have is alcohol. And, believe me, I've been doing alcohol for 40 years – there is not just go pick this off the shelf and this is the answer to get at an alcohol challenge. You know, at the heart of so many of the problems that we have for our people, including, quite frankly, self-medication for those that have been in pretty tough combat situations, is how we get – how do we get at that? And believe me, that's not going to change over the 12 months you're here at Maxwell, and leading that issue as a commander is really critical.

And I'd extend that to how we take care of our people who are wounded; how do we take care of the families that have fallen? We don't – the model that I use – we have a model that says, do the best we can in the Department of Defense for the wounded and their families. Then move them to the VA. We hope the VA – none of you have had tours in the VA. You didn't grow up in it. You don't know much about it. Are you going to take your most precious resource and say, okay, over to the VA, hope you do well. The VA does as well as they can, and they can and then we say, off to America; hope you have a nice life. That is not an acceptable model for these who have sacrificed so much, whose lives have changed forever, and whose dream is – the American dream is just the same. They want a house, they want their kids to go to school, and they'd like an education, and they'd like two jobs.

And we are a resource-rich country, for those who've sacrificed so much, that we ought to be able to do that – have a community-based system which reaches all of those who've sacrificed so much and takes care of them for the rest of their lives. And that isn't just going to happen. We're going to have to work to make that happen and reach people who will help us make that happen.

It's interesting; I was in Israel in December, having a conversation about this – about a lot of things with the Israelis. It was right after the NIE. I'd just been in the Gulf, so I was – it was two or three weeks after the NIE, so the Israelis – very good friends of mine – they had a little different view of how to view the Iranian threat that was expressed in the NIE. And so I had an all-day discussion with them about this and I was very much in the listening mode most of the day. Finally we got through that and I said to this wounded, I'm just thinking they might have a different model.

In Israel, when you take command, one of the last things you sign for is a log that holds the commander accountable for every wounded member of that command and their family since the command was founded 60 years ago. And it is an accountable action requirement and it is something you get inspected on when you're in command. That model is a little different. Now, I was having this model with the chief of staff of great the Israeli army and he opens his wallet, pulls out a list with 12 family names on it that he personally keeps in touch with for the rest of his life or their lives. Now, I'm not arguing we should do that per se, but we ought to have that effect. That's the standard. The best I could tell that's the gold standard.

So we just need to think about that in this time of war for those who sacrifice so much, and never forget – and I don't mean just think about it – never forget the families of the fallen. Many of the spouses that Debra meets with want to stay in touch with their service. Their – mostly husband, but their husband or wife died doing what they loved doing, and that's what families hang onto in many ways, and they want to stay in touch. Too often we are not active enough to make sure that they're okay. So all of this rolls up into making sure that we lead well in these very, very challenging times. And the times are going to get – my view is they're going to get harder before they get easier.

I just met – many of you probably know I met last week – in fact, it was a week ago today – I think it was a week ago today – with my Russian counterpart, and obviously what Russia did recently, a couple months ago, in Georgia certainly startled the world and gave everybody a wakeup call, and I spent a lot of time in NATO in Europe and there is a requirement for us to stay together with respect to that. We've having an election here with the financial crisis – I have dealt an awful lot with Pakistan and Afghanistan. They come together. As I've evolved over the last year, heavy focus on Afghanistan – it's got to be both. When you go – those of you that have been there know; when you go to the Durand Line, that's a line that's drawn by the West; it is certainly not recognized by the tribes. It says a lot about the need – how these two countries are very much interwoven and having a – one of the reasons we're going through this strategic review right now is to look at how to incorporate a broad, comprehensive approach for Pakistan?

And I also believe we've got to include India in a way where they contribute very positively to de-tensioning and to solutions out there that create the kind of security we need so that people can start to live in a more secure environment and have a life that in fact raises their standard of living.

So all those things – I mean, there's a lot more than that. There's an awful lot – obviously there's a lot going on. You serve at an exciting time, a time with many challenges, but I would argue those challenges create many opportunities, and it's going to be a whole lot different 10 years from now than it is right now. I can't see exactly how that's going to be, which gets back to being fluent and be able to lead our people, keep them informed about what's going on as best you can – much more transparent, much more collaborative than we've been in the past across our services, across our country – I mean, the militaries in other parts of the world.

And lastly I'll leave you with this: I'm seeing later, actually tomorrow, the new head of the ISI, who I've come to know because I've been in and out of Pakistan a bunch of times. He's brought with him a handful of Pakistani generals, at least one of whom – maybe more but I know one of them has never been in the United States. So when we sanctioned Pakistan and they were not – we were not allowed to interact with them for 12 years, there is a gap from major to one-star in the Pakistani military that they don't know who we are. And it goes back to the relationship piece I talked about here, and we've got to fill that gap if we're going to have a relationship with that country. And they have very skewed – my opinion – very skewed views of America, seen through the lens of their media more than anything else, or the national/international media there. And I would argue, as is the case – has proven it and the case has been in history, come to Montgomery, spend a year here, and your view of America is going to change a lot.

So thanks for what you're doing. You're leading at an exciting time, and my expectations are that you will lead and lead well into the future. Thank you.

I'll be happy to take questions. Go ahead.

Q: Sir, Paul Williams, Flight 25. You've mentioned several things, several things, change, the interagency, security, an explosion in ISR and supporting unmanned aircraft, and also opportunity – holding our adversaries at risk. Cyberspace is developing as a war-fighting behemoth. It sits at the junction of all of those. Where do you see the department going in terms of cyberspace over the next 10 to 15 years?

ADM. MULLEN: Great question, and of the things – areas of expertise for us and for our country, there probably is no more critical area for us in the future than cyberspace and all that means. And I would also emphasize, equally so – I think about these things in domains, space being another one. And as a friend of mine said – because obviously I've been in the Navy a long time and one of the biggest challenges we have historically – this is very – relatively speaking, a very unique mission to the Navy is finding submarines, and underwater is a very opaque environment. And as a friend of mine said the other day, if you think ASW is a tough mission, you know, it is transparent compared to space. And so I included – we do in all our

discussions; we include a very active discussion about warfare areas to include space and cyberspace in the future.

I would say that in the cyber world, not enough of us who are in leadership positions, one, grew up in it and, two, know a lot about it. So from that standpoint I stay very active to try to become informed, to try to make good decisions. I think, reflective of the challenge is the focus that the Air Force – that the chief and the secretary had on this to stand up a cyber command, clearly to meet the needs, recognize the threat, and also start to range people up that can do this for a living. That to me was a step. That in fact may happen in the future. We are not organized well enough yet, in my view, in the department and then in our government, because this goes far beyond just a military challenge. This isn't just about dot.mil or even dot.gov; this is about dot.com, and what does that mean? And this is a big elephant, and as has been said many times, you sort of take it one bite at a time.

There's been a tremendous – President Bush, to his credit, has put a substantial investment into cyberspace in the last couple of years. I'm talking billions now; I'm not talking \$100 million. I mean, it is billions, so we're trying to figure out what's the best way to spend that. I mean, we have it allocated in certain ways, but it's going to take skills, it's going to take some time, and we don't have a lot of time. And I – I mean, I literally personally try to get smarter on this with individuals who've spent their life in this so far to try to understand it better so that I can make recommendations and decisions with respect to cyber.

I think it is a growing, booming, vital requirement for the future. And then whether we get to a point where each service has a command or not – I mean, I just don't know. I think we'll work our way through that as we understand it. The potential, to me, in both directions, is huge. And it's not just – it's about defense and attack and operate, and actually – this is in my sometimes oversimplifying way – they all sort of come together. I don't – you know, having a defense group and then an attack group and then having an ops group, from a war-fighting standpoint I don't get it yet. I mean, I know that's kind of how we're looking at it – that's okay – but I think we've got to – the lines there are pretty blurred with respect to where we are and where we need to go. But it's a very, very critical area.

A few years ago we were looking at one of the war plans and just reviewing one of the war plans, and one of the – one of my officers said, you know, this may have already started. And what he was talking about was cyber. So that – I'll never forget that and we need to be mindful of that.

So how do I create a cyber force? How do I take – what do you do? What's your background?

Q: Sir, communications, emphasis on cyberspace.

ADM. MULLEN: Okay, all right. I'm shocked. But just you knowing about this or just you taking care of it in a command structure isn't going to work because this is, my view, mainstream war-fighting and we're going to have to figure out how to incorporate it very directly into the overall approach to warfare.

Put your hands up early so we can get those mikes to you.

Q: Sir, David March, Flight 11. As the –

ADM. MULLEN: What's the best flight, by the way?

AUDIENCE: (Cheers.)

ADM. MULLEN: Okay.

Q: Sir, as the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, you advise the president and national command authorities. What do you view as our most pressing or challenging issues and how might the new administration or Congress best help us in resolving them?

ADM. MULLEN: Actually I'd put that second part a little differently. What our responsibility is, is how do we help them resolve it as we advise and serve? I put sort of my top three priorities, first of all a broader Middle East. Now, that covers a lot of ground, but it's clearly the need to win in the wars we're in, Iraq and Afghanistan, and Afghanistan is Afghanistan and Pakistan together, specifically. Things are better in Iraq. If you haven't been there lately, it's extraordinary what's happened. Still fragile, still reversible back, but so much better than a year ago sometimes it's hard to really describe how much better. And that goes back to you and the young men and women who have made that happen. David Petraeus gets a lot of credit for the surge. Right, got that, but the individuals that executed that and made the difference were the men and women on the ground that really turned that around.

So I'm hopeful that we will continue to be able to drawdown in Iraq. And you've seen the politics play out in Iraq in a burgeoning democracy right now with the SOFA and where that goes. The economy is actually – someone said to me the other day that, you know, one of the economies least affected by the financial crisis right now is in Iraq. Isn't that ironic? Because they didn't buy any of this bad paper. So the economy, you know, that's starting to move along in ways that are very helpful, and in the end it's not about military strengthening; it's about security throughout the world, quite frankly. It's about security so that parents can raise their kids to a better standard of living, and I don't care whether that's Kosovo or FATA or Iraq or Afghanistan or the Philippines or in Colombia or, you know, where there are challenges in other parts of the world. That's sort of the – that's an underpinning challenge.

But I expand it way, you know, beyond Iraq and Afghanistan to Pakistan to Iran – you know, the maligning influence in Iran continues to have their continued development, in my view, seeking a nuclear weapon, which will be very destabilizing in that part of the world. They are a country – obviously a nation state, but they are also a network, and that network funds terror. It does it in Hezbollah, it does it in Hamas, it does it in Iraq, it does it in Afghanistan, and that's the behavior that's got to stop, in my view, for them to be seen as a nation state that garners international support for what their objectives are.

We need to be – how many of you have been to Manas? The rest of you have not, obviously, and I made my first trip there last Christmas – incredibly well-run Air Force base. It is a tribute to what O-6s can do without immediate oversight. Remarkably well-run base, about as far east as you can get before you get to China, as it turns out. And for those of you that haven't been there, I'd just say they are – you know, they have executed that mission, without which we would be in big trouble in Afghanistan without – there's no question about that.

But the reason I pick out Kyrgyzstan and Manas is because of the “-stans,” all of them, and their – you know, Central Asia is an area of growing importance and interest and concern, and obviously there is a rich history, but we need to pay more attention to that. So, you know, I'm looking in that direction. And I sort of call it from Beirut to Tehran, but that's sort of the first priority, and how do we get that right? That takes resources, commitment. You've got to be there, in many cases, in order to make a difference. It's the most unstable part of the world. Stability in that part of the world is a very special objective we need to try to achieve, and we need to be there physically – and I don't mean we just the United States. I think we need to be there with our coalition friends in order to make a difference, and there's more and more of that.

Just sort of an extension of that is the whole issue of piracy. Have you studied that yet? Has anybody solved that problem? That's a tough problem. And one of the things I worry about is we're just going to send, you know, a lot of ships. And when you look at the commercial traffic, there aren't enough ships in the world to escort all the ships. And then we will rest comfortably that, okay, if we just have ships out there – which is a pretty expensive way to get at it but it doesn't solve it long-term because it doesn't get rid of the pirates. And this is a going concern these pirates have. They're very well-funded. They're not taking bags of cash to the beach. No, this money is going into bank accounts from a couple of very, very significant syndicates, and I think we've got to figure out how to get at that internationally, that legal path, in order to close this thing off. So obviously lots going on there.

Secondly – the second priority is what I call the health of the force. We're in our seventh year of war right now. We've been executing rotations out to 15 months. The president made a decision not too long ago to reduce deployments for the active Army to 12 months, but what we shouldn't forget is that went into effect 1 August. There is still plenty of BCTs that deployed before 1 August that are on the 15-month tour. And essentially our dwell time is one to one – time home equals time deployed – and we've got to figure out a way – and that's where the Army and the Marine Corps – the Marine Corps has been doing seven on, seven off since this war started. Their dwell time is one to one, in some cases a little less than that, as it is in the active Army.

But we've got to get to a point where we can relieve that pressure so you've got more time at home. And then when you're home, we've got things like pers-tempo and op-tempo; I have a term called “home-tempo,” so that when you're home, you're actually sleeping in your own bed, because you can be home and you can be home for 12 months and six months of that gone training – you know, training up for the next run. And in the case of the Marine Corps, when I talk to Marines about this, you know, they're home 30 days and then it starts. That's it.

You know, they are starting to crank it up for the next run, and their head starts to go right back into the game. We've got to figure out a way to get to two to one, and that's tied directly to build the force. The Marine Corps will be at 202 this year at the end of '09. We just deployed the first additional battalion that that growth provided last month. We'll deploy the second one in February, but we're not going to be there with the Army for another two to three years. We're not going to have built out the Army in that regard. So I don't have relief brigade combat teams.

The other thing that has been a great indication for all of us is the definition of what an enabler is. Our list of enablers for this war has expanded dramatically from where we first started. We didn't know what ISR was really when this war started. We knew we needed a whole lot more. We are at a point now where we're at 25 or 26 orbits in CENTCOM right now. We're going to double that in the next year, which is going to put a lot of pressure on training, on systems, and balancing that so we can generate to the capacity that we just haven't been able to so far overall, and in our people, as an example.

So there's an awful lot of pressure on our people and there's a lot of pressure on our families, and specifically there's an awful lot of pressure on our children of those families. And so that's why I'm talking about the importance of the family programs. And it can't just be about the programs. One of the things that I would love you to spend a little time on this year is it's about output; it's not about input. It isn't about how many sorties I fly; it is about how many sorties I flew that made a difference. How do we think about that?

We raised you to think about influence, and we have to be – and this is going to be that much more critical, particularly if the budget comes down, to understand, no kidding, what's the output side of what we're doing, and looking at that and understanding a little bit about Lean Six Sigma, which is not some fad. It's about throughput. And you can apply it to flight training, you can apply it to sorties of the deck, you can apply it to just about anything we're doing to understand that so that we get a higher level of output in everything that we're doing, and I believe that we can. I've got Army brigades right now hanging on to Shadow UAVs because they don't trust anybody else with them.

The whole issue of trust – I've got a level of efficiency that I'm not achieving in ISR where I am desperate for more of it because we kept that stuff at the tactical level. Now, you know, the headline will read, Mullen says, you know, take away the UAVs, take the Shadow away. I didn't say that. I didn't say that. So get all those sentences when you quote me, will you? But we need to be thinking about trusting and taking some risk in order to make the joint force better, not just make where I am better. And I've believed for a long time, the more of that we do in our commands, the stronger we'll be in the long run. We might – we're taking a little extra risk up front, but the integration and the way we operate in the future will be greatly and positively affected there.

And that's sort of back to family programs. I don't need anymore family programs right now. What I need to know is the family programs that are out there are working – no kidding they're working. And where we travel, child care is a huge issue. Every single base – I think there's been – there's been two bases that have solved child care, where there's enough, and

there are huge challenges associated with that. And we've got to break some of the china with respect to that. Like I said, we've got too many peacetime rules. The seventh year of war, the way we function is we take a peacetime rule across a personnel issue or something like that, and we just morph it to wartime. We need to break it – you know, just break the china and say, okay, clean sheet of paper; here's how I do this, and then enter that into the system, whether it's families or personnel policies or things like that. So lots of issues associated with the health of the force. It's something we look at all the time.

And then lastly, the third big chunk for me is the rest of the world. It's a big world. It isn't all CENTCOM, you know, but I have some 80 percent of my focus there notionally and I am paying a price for that in risk that's building up in other places of the world. That's just a fact. And being able to deploy forces, to provide training to small units, interagency through AFRICOM, if you will, which we just stood up, is a huge risk mitigator in the long run, and I'm limited in my ability to do that right now just because of the focus – rightfully so – the top focus on the wars, et cetera.

So that's kind of how I look at the big buckets, if you will, and certainly that's my focus for – it's my focus for the current administration and it will certainly be my focus for the next administration. That said, you know, a new president – no matter who wins, a new president is going to come in with new ideas, and that's always been the case, and I think that's very positive, and I'll do everything, you know, in my power to give him my best military advice based on the policies that he wants to carry out. He'll make a decision and we'll march off.

Q: Good morning, sir. Lieutenant Commander Bailey from the best, Flight 3. I was curious about your thoughts in the current op-tempo, the role of the reserve component and what changes you might see to ensure readiness.

ADM. MULLEN: Are you in the reserve?

Q: Yes, sir.

ADM. MULLEN: I think that – you know, one of my measures of effectiveness is when someone in the active side asks me a question about the reserves, or, you know, I've got an F-15 pilot that stands up and asks me about cyber, for example. I can't say enough, specifically in this area, about what the reserve and guard has done. We would not be anywhere close to where we are without the reserves and guard pitching in as they have. So I talk about on the active duty Army side a one-to-one op-tempo.

An awful lot of Army guard units are deploying for the second time now. We'd like them back for five years and then deploy again – to get them one in five. We're at about a one over and three back – three, three-and-a-half, four specifically. There's an extraordinary number of volunteers who do this, and it's back to – this isn't a ground fight, it's not an air fight, it is a joint fight, and we are all in this together. And the contributions that have in fact accrued to us by virtue of what has happened in the reserve and guard Army, and the Air guard, it's just been extraordinary.

And there are a couple of areas that I think are changing faster than I can see where they end up, and one area is guard and reserve and the other is medicine – battlefield medicine. Things are moving so fast there and it's been so good and so leading-edge, again, I'm not sure – I know it changes fundamentally forever in those two areas; I just haven't figured out exactly what it looks like. And so I feel a particular – so strongly about the integration requirement, which is why I go back to that example, for the guard and reserve into our active forces, that they are as vital to us as any part of our military. We've got to continue to change there. We've got to continue to be further integrated, and all that means. Career paths are going to have to be more integrated than they've been in the past. And I think they're going to have to change. And, again, I can't say enough about how well – how important and how well those – the reserves and guard have been in this fight.

The other part about the reserve and guard which is so important is – well, it's two things. One is the support of American businesses that have allowed members to deploy as frequently as they have as truly been part of the very patriotic view from so much of our country. I can't say enough about that, and what a difference employers like that make.

And then, secondly, one of the things I worry about – I was talking to General Peck – we have consolidated almost the entire school's command here – PME here in Montgomery, Alabama, and we've done this with various functions and various services. We've been BRACed into this over time because of the overhead that we've had. And I would just argue we need to be careful about how consolidated we get, because one of the things I worry about as we move out of neighborhoods around the country is neighborhoods around the country don't know us anymore, and one of the ways I reach the country is through the reserves and the guard, the citizen soldiers, citizen sailors that are out there that touch every community in our country and who care a lot. And I worry that we're 40 percent smaller than we were in 2000 – I'm sorry, in 1989 or 1990.

So how do we make sure that America, who actually invests in us, has very high expectations for us, how do we touch them throughout the land? How do they know who we are? This isn't just about Rotary here in Montgomery or at Fort Hood or Fort Bliss or Nellis or North Hampton Roads. This is about reaching places in the middle of our country – throughout our country, actually, that we don't normally go to. How do we do that? And I think that's a real communication requirement for us from the position of responsibility so that we're in touch with the military – I mean, we're in touch with the communities who care so much about us, who have the highest regard for us, certainly the highest I have ever seen, but do they really know us or do they just get to figure it out through the media? And I think it's important they really know us by us being there enough so that they know who we are

Q: Given the talk amongst the current administration and political candidates about victory in Iraq, what are the military end states to enable the U.S. to declare this victory?

ADM. MULLEN: The goal – actually, the goal in Iraq and the goal in Afghanistan have much the same kind of contest. You know, a government – on the military side, you know, a security force and military force that can provide for its own security, and all that means. And so

part of the great success over the last year in Iraq has been the growth and the competence of the Iraqi security forces. A year ago – two summers ago now – it's a little more than a year ago, rightfully there was a huge concern about the Iraqi police force, and in my visits and in reports and the commanders on the ground talk about their evolution and that they've gotten a lot better. And the issue of corruption was something that was just rampant in the Iraqi police force. And not that it's gone, but it's certainly diminished greatly, as an example.

So being able to provide for its own security, having an economy that sustains itself, and as easy as it is to say they've got 70 or 80 billion in the bank, they have very few financial institutions that have ever been set up to execute the money. They've got a cash box but they've got no way to get the cash – you know, the cash out of the box. They don't have – they haven't had an electronic banking system, for example. They don't have a ton of people trained in how to do this. So we're working that hard.

So there are institutional requirements in government. The governance ability, the rule of law, those kinds of things, so that the economic piece, the governance piece, and clearly the political piece, all of that I think will put us in a position – you know, assuming conditions continue to improve – to continue to draw down. But this is not – it hasn't been, I don't think it will be that, gee, there's the goal line. I have the victory pennant in my hand. I'm now there. I plant it, you know, and we walk. I just don't see it. I see us being there for an extended period of time at some level, obviously with the permission of the Iraqi people and the Iraqi government, but it is those big pieces, and they're all improving, that move us in a direction where we can dramatically reduce our force level and turn it over to the Iraqi leadership of all its institutions and the Iraqi people, and that's where we're headed.

I would argue the same is true in Afghanistan; it's just the road's, you know, a little bit longer, a lot longer at this particular point in time, particularly because we don't have institutions that underpin it. The governance is very shaky. Obviously the insurgency is up. And beneath all this is the economic institutions, the development piece. Afghanistan is the fifth-poorest country in the world. If you put Afghanistan in Africa, they'd be on the bottom of Africa. And so we've got a long way to go from the development standpoint in Afghanistan and it's going to take the commitment of many nations, not the United States. It's going to take the commitment of the international community to continue to invest there so we can get their economy going to a point where the same kind of thing can happen

ADM. MULLEN: What's unique about Flight 25?

Q: Flight 25 is very nice – because we have two international officers, one from Israel and one from Nicaragua. All right, I have a four-word question for you. How is intel doing?

ADM. MULLEN: Actually intel is doing great. I spend a lot of time in the intel world, and more so than I ever have in my life, first of all. I think Director McConnell has done yeoman's work organizing 17 different intel agencies who all have their own forces, and there is goodness to that, but integrating is important as well.

And the focus on it – to me one of the great lessons of this war is what I call the integration of intel and ops – absolutely mandatory. For many years I called it the, you’ve got to knock down the green wall. You’ve got to get in the same room. It’s got to be transparent and collaborative. And the culture is to not be transparent. The culture is how close can I hold it and who’s cleared? You know, we’re still asking those questions as something major is happening, and that doesn’t answer the mail with respect to how fast we need to be.

So I think we’ve made a lot of progress. I think that those that have been on the battlefield in Iraq and Afghanistan would tell you the same. It’s the single-biggest change. And it goes back to the speed of war that I talked about. The ability – and I think we’re living in a time where we’re all going to have fleeting targets – fleeting – and you’re going to get one look and it will be seconds or a second, and that piece of information that you get, you better plug it in pretty quickly and it better get you to the right answer. Otherwise, whatever targeting solution was applicable there is going to be compounded to be more difficult and the threat is going to be more significant.

So many of us have spent – I have, over the – particularly the last 10 or 15 years of my life, you know, closing the targeting loop down in terms of the cycle, reducing the time, and I think it’s more and more. I think it applies in information as much as it does – it applies kinetically and non-kinetically. So there’s an awful lot going on there. It’s much – it is much improved. It does speak to the essence of what you can do when people are dominant, and the sense of urgency and the ideas that come out that never would have even be thought of. And so how do you as a leader create that same sense of urgency, you know, when we are not, and yet we’re living in a world where we’ve got to.

And there are a couple of thoughts. Intel is, even at the most highly classified level, more information, and we are lousy at packaging information. And what do I get? I get this stream that just keeps coming at me and coming at me and coming at me, you know, until it wants to lay me flat and say, did you get enough? And we also engineer systems – I think the biggest – our biggest advantage in the future – our asymmetric advantage is what’s in here, in the United States of America, and that we engineer systems which adapt to what’s in here, not make me adapt to an engineering system that somebody had a great idea with.

So when I walk in the command center, or you do, it literally reconfigures based on knowing you’re in the room, and intel, as all information systems do, struggles with that. I still get, you know, volumes every morning and I put that in the category of we know that what he needs is in there somewhere; I hope he finds it. And you’ve got to – and part of that is my problem because I’ve got to get up enough guts to say this is what I need, but part of it is the system. It just wants to shove information at you as rapidly as you can take it – actually more rapidly than you can take it.

So we’ve come a long way and we need to work on it. It is not intel – that is obvious, you know, those two, but others – it’s not just up to intel experts or to operators. It’s up to all of us to be integrated in so many ways that we haven’t been before, but it’s been huge for the success that we now see in the fight that we’re in, but we’ve got a long way to go.

Okay, I think I've got time for one more.

Q: Sir, Lynn Solar from Flight 15.

ADM. MULLEN: What is special about Flight 15?

Q: We're really not all that special.

ADM. MULLEN: Okay.

Q: You talked a bit about personnel and force structure and things like that, and as a J I've spent a lot of man hours, received a lot of man hours spent and money and time spent on discharging highly decorated individuals based on sexual orientation. And with the changes in society's recognition of people with homosexual orientation as well as the incorporation and support provided by a lot of the civilians, I was wondering if you could give us your thoughts on the continued relevance of DOD's current policy.

Q: I thought you were going to ask me a budget question. We currently have a policy obviously summarized as don't ask, don't tell. It's a policy that's been out there since – I think 1993 it was put in place – and that's the policy that I support. Should, you know, a new administration make a decision that – or look to change that policy, certainly it is – as was pointed out earlier, my responsibility is to give my best military advice, and I will do that, and believe me I won't do it just – I won't do it based on polls; I won't do it just based on my own personal beliefs. If we are to make a decision like this in this kind of area, it's an area that needs to be very well thought through, very well understood, and that what I owe the president in this case, should he want to do this over my best military advice, is the impact of the decision on who we are as a military, and that would be – it would be my intent to do that.

And it's one that obviously I take very seriously and would want to understand that impact as well as I could before I ever made a recommendation one way or another, and to include senior leaders throughout the military, senior enlisted leaders throughout the military to understand, again, the impact should that policy change – should that be the desire. So, you know, we will see where that goes. We'll see if that in fact is a discussion that we're going to have with a new administration. I don't know that one way or another, but those are kind of the criteria. That's how I think about it, to make sure that any decision that gets made is made in a way that doesn't impact on who we are and our ability to carry out our mission, or if it has an impact, what that means, okay?

Again, thanks for all you do. Thanks to your family. I'd ask you a second time, please tell your families – give them my appreciation for all they represent. And take good care of yourself here. When I was here before it was football and I assume it still is. Is that true? You pay attention to the football and some other sports in this part of the country. Take care and enjoy the time you're here. Enjoy each other; enjoy your families. Take the time off. Take the time to get recharged. Think about the problems. Think about the challenges. Think about the opportunities, that you're going to be right back in here next summer, a year from this fall, and I

need you to be better than you were and I need some of those creative juices that can solve these difficult problems and create whole new worlds applied when you get out.

Thanks and God bless.