

2001

## President's Forum

Rodney P. Rempt

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

---

### Recommended Citation

Rempt, Rodney P. (2001) "President's Forum," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 54 : No. 4 , Article 2.  
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol54/iss4/2>

This President's Forum is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu](mailto:repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu).

Rear Admiral Rempt was raised in the Los Angeles suburb of Van Nuys and graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy with the class of 1966. He holds master's degrees in systems analysis from Stanford University and in national security and strategic studies from the Naval War College. Initial assignments at sea included deployments to Vietnam aboard USS Coontz (DLG 9) and USS Somers (DDG 34). His first sea command was USS Antelope (PG 86), one of four missile-armed patrol gunboats homeported in Naples, Italy.

Rear Admiral Rempt commanded USS Callaghan (DDG 994) during two western Pacific/Indian Ocean deployments, and USS Bunker Hill (CG 52), homeported in Yokosuka, Japan. While aboard Bunker Hill, he served for eighteen months as the Anti-Air Warfare Commander for Seventh Fleet.

Duties ashore included three years in the weapon prototyping office of the Naval Sea Systems Command as the initial project officer for the Mark 41 Vertical Launch System; on the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) as program coordinator for the Aegis Weapon System; as the director of the prospective commanding officer/executive officer department at the Surface Warfare Officers Schools Command, in Newport; and as the Director, Anti-Air Warfare Requirements Division (OP-75) on the CNO's staff. Rear Admiral Rempt also served in the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, where he initiated the development of Naval Theater Ballistic Missile Defense, continuing those efforts as Director, Theater Air Defense (N865) on the CNO's staff.

In July 1996 Rear Admiral Rempt assumed duties as Program Executive Officer, Theater Air Defense, additionally serving as the U.S. Steering Committee member for the Nato Seasparrow and Rolling Airframe Missile multinational programs. In May 1998 he was assigned as the first Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Theater Combat Systems; in that capacity he was the principal advisor on the introduction of naval theater ballistic missile defense and the development of advanced shipboard combat systems. In June 2000, Rear Admiral Rempt was assigned as the first Assistant Chief of Naval Operations for Missile Defense. In September of that year, he additionally became Director, Surface Warfare (N76), responsible for all surface warfare personnel initiatives, ship programs, and combat systems. Rear Admiral Rempt assumed duties as the forty-eighth President of the Naval War College on 22 August 2001.

His personal awards include the Legion of Merit (three awards), the Meritorious Service Medal (three awards), and the Navy Commendation Medal (three awards, the second with combat V device).

## PRESIDENT'S FORUM

---



*We know that this war is different in nature from any we have fought in the past. It is not a war for territory, resources, or hegemony.*

THESE ARE MOMENTOUS TIMES. While I write this in late October, the nation is at war. As President George W. Bush stated to a joint session of Congress on 20 September 2001: “We are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice, or justice to our enemies, justice will be done.”

It is both a great honor and a great responsibility to take command of the Naval War College at this point in history. To the faculty and staff of the Naval War College and the Navy Warfare Development Command; to present and past students; and to our entire Navy and Marine Corps, as well as those of our allies and friends, I promise I will do my utmost to provide sound guidance and strong encouragement in the months and years ahead. My assignment is a dream come true—a chance to educate tomorrow’s leaders and to develop a vision of the future Navy they will command.

### OUR MISSION

In Newport we have two clear, mutually supporting missions. One is to educate the future leaders of our navy and our nation. Led by the Provost, Rear Admiral Barbara McGann, our distinguished faculty and staff provide a world-class education—focusing on the principles of war. The credentials and accomplishments of our faculty are phenomenal, and the awards and accolades they have received are too numerous to mention. I know they would be the first to insist, however, that their greatest satisfaction lies in seeing their students who have risen to high rank using their Naval War College education on behalf of our great nation.

Our other mission is to define the future of the Navy through the development of new operational concepts, experimentation at the fleet level, and refinement of tactical doctrine. The staff of the Navy Warfare Development Command, led by Rear Admiral Bob Sprigg, is propelling the Navy into the twenty-first century. Together with the Strategic Studies Group, led by Admiral Jim Hogg, they are working to define the next Navy and the Navy after next. Whether testing new hull forms, conceiving unmanned air vehicles, or exploring the potential of networks to allow real-time targeting, they are in the process of transforming our service. This is exciting work!

These two missions—education of leaders and definition of the Navy—are the key ingredients of keeping our Navy strong. They are especially pertinent as the students of past classes wrestle with the great issues that face our nation in the Terror War.

#### THE TERROR WAR

History has taught us—and our recent experiences in Vietnam, Iraq, Kosovo, and elsewhere have confirmed—that we must clearly understand the fundamentals of war:

- Goals: our own, and those of our enemy;
- Strategies: alternate paths for achieving our goals and thwarting those of our enemy;
- Assessment: how we know whether we are winning or losing;
- End-state: the situation we desire at the end of the war.

The table on the next page lists ten questions our strategic and political leaders must consider as we embark on a war. Armed conflict is a two-sided or multisided endeavor, and outcomes cannot be guaranteed. Few go to war to lose, but in a struggle between opposing sides, one is bound to lose. Considerable effort must be undertaken to ensure we have explored all the dimensions of national-level strategy and policy issues so that we clearly understand the context in which we are fighting. In order to win, we need to know what we seek to accomplish and then ensure that the means are sufficient and appropriate to achieve that end.

*Identifying Our Enemies.* President Bush has helped us in defining who our enemies are—not only terrorists and their support networks but, more importantly, “nations that provide aid or safe havens to terrorism. . . . [A]ny nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.” Some would believe that the notion of nation-states does not apply in the Terror War. However, history reminds us that pirates, bandits, or

### QUESTIONS OF STRATEGY: THE TERROR WAR

---

1. What are U.S. goals and objectives?
    - What must we do to win?
  2. What are our enemies' objectives?
    - What must they do to win?
  3. What kind of a war are we involved in?
    - Resources? Influence? Ideology?
  4. Who or what are our enemies?
    - How do they assess us as adversaries?
  5. What are our enemies' strategies?
    - What is their center of gravity?
  6. What should U.S. strategy be?
    - What are the alternative approaches?
  7. What are our coalition objectives and strategy?
    - How important is coalition support?
  8. For what purposes is military power applicable?
    - How should we apply it?
  9. What end-state are we looking for?
    - What constitutes victory?
  10. How can we assess how well we are doing?
    - What are the metrics?
- 

others who live outside the law cannot long survive if the state they live in pursues them with diligence. It is the safe haven and support of sympathetic nations that enable terrorists to go on. So it really does come down to nation-state versus nation-state—those that harbor terrorists versus those that abhor them. States that support the rule of law cannot rationally support terrorism at the same time.

Our president has called for waging war against any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorists; such support is the terrorists' center of gravity. If we can dismantle their support structure, hound them mercilessly in every nation of the earth, and go after any group or nation that supports them, our war will be successful. We will reach the point where terrorists cannot take refuge or have the wherewithal to plan another sick event. The world will have ousted this cancer from our midst.

Of course, today only a few nations openly sponsor, support, or allow terrorists within their borders. The world rightfully has spoken out in indignation against this menace to freedom and the rule of law. But rhetoric is not enough to stop terrorists. States defiant in their support of terrorism must be compelled by force to accept the rule of law embraced by the world.

*Using Military Force.* The president's ultimatum was the proper first step to warn complicit governments of our intention to use military force. The terrorists, their support organizations, and the governments harboring them are subject to attack. How we use military force is, of course, critical. We must demonstrate that our enemy is terrorists—not Afghans, Arabs, or Muslims—and we must do so in word and deed, especially in our use of military force. We want to avoid encouraging more terrorist attacks through injuring innocent civilians, causing extensive collateral damage, or committing human rights abuses. In this war, civilian casualties and general suffering among the Afghan population would probably embolden support for the terrorists. In this case “a little stick,” judiciously applied, may be much more effective than the “big stick” of large-scale attacks.

Once our overall war aims and resulting strategies are in place, defining suitable and achievable objectives for military action will become critical. In this we will have to curb our expectations of what military force might actually accomplish; not all our goals are achievable with bullets and bombs. Designing a suc-

---

*The terrorists who attacked the United States on September 11 aimed at one nation but wounded an entire world. Rarely, if ever, has the world been as united as it was on that terrible day. It was a unity born of horror, of fear, of outrage, and of profound sympathy with the American people. This unity also reflected the fact that the World Trade Center, in this uniquely international city, was home to men and women of every faith from some 60 nations. This was an attack on all humanity, and all humanity has a stake in defeating the forces behind it.*

KOFI A. ANNAN, 21 September 2001

---

successful military campaign against the shadowy and elusive worldwide terrorist network is a tall challenge. In the end, the overall effort will have to be political, diplomatic, and even economic if we are to achieve the president's goal of finding, stopping, and defeating "every terrorist group of global reach."

We know that this war is different in nature from any we have fought in the past. It is not a war for territory, resources, or hegemony. It is a war of freedom against tyranny, justice against mass murder, open

markets and capitalism against malnutrition and unrelieved poverty. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld helped define how we will know we have won: "The ultimate victory in this war is when everyone who wants to can . . . get up, let your children go to school, go out of the house and not in fear, stand here on a sidewalk and not worry about a truck bomb driving into us."

What we are fighting for are our basic beliefs and freedoms as Americans, the freedoms guaranteed us by our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and the democratic rule of law. These freedoms were violently taken away from those who died in lower Manhattan and the Pentagon. That is why we must act.

RODNEY P. REMPT

*Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy  
President, Naval War College*