NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
Monterey, California

THESIS

IMPORTANCE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE IN MEDITERRANEAN AFFAIRS

by

Timothy E. Kalley

June 2001

Thesis Advisor: Douglas Porch
Second Reader: David Spain

Approved for Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited

Form SF298 Citation Data

Report Date ("DD MON YYYY") 15 Jun 2001	Report Type N/A	Dates Covered (from... to) ("DD MON YYYY")

Title and Subtitle IMPORTANCE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE IN MEDITERRANEAN AFFAIRS	**Contract or Grant Number**
	Program Element Number
Authors	**Project Number**
	Task Number
	Work Unit Number
Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5138	**Performing Organization Number(s)**
Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es)	**Monitoring Agency Acronym**
	Monitoring Agency Report Number(s)

Distribution/Availability Statement
Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

Supplementary Notes

Abstract

Subject Terms

Document Classification unclassified	**Classification of SF298** unclassified
Classification of Abstract unclassified	**Limitation of Abstract** unlimited
Number of Pages 122	

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE	*Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave Blank)	2. REPORT DATE June 2001	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Importance of United States Naval Forward Presence in Mediterranean Affairs		**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**	
6. AUTHOR(S) Timothy E. Kalley			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		**10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**	

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.	12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE

13. ABSTRACT

This thesis describes for the benefits of maintaining United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean. It encompasses several themes to justify its point of view. It argues that the Mediterranean has been important to the United States for over 200 years. It describes the significant United States political and economic interests in the region. As NATO's strongest member, the United States has a vested interest to ensure that the Mediterranean remains open and accessible.

Geographically the "Middle Sea" is an essential link between the Atlantic, the Persian Gulf and beyond. It forms a bridge across which three continents interact. But the Mediterranean's geographic configuration and complex political environment also makes it an operational challenge. Finally, the complexities and acrimony of Mediterranean politics calls for the United States Navy to support a variety of missions from "stability and support" to "Small-Scale Contingencies" (SSCs) or potentially more conventional operations. However, the political, economic and geographic characteristics of the Mediterranean make it very difficult for military forces to operate there.

14. SUBJECT TERMS Naval Forward Presence, NATO, Mediterranean Sea, Barbary Wars, World War II, Middle East, Arab/Israeli Wars, Libya, Lebanon, Bosnia, Kosovo, Balkans, Pilot Rescue, Reconnaissance, Tomahawk Missile Attacks, Amphibious Intervention, Armed Intervention, Cooperative Engagement Capability.	**15. NUMBER OF PAGES** 122
	16. PRICE CODE

17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT
Unclassified	Unclassified	Unclassified	UL

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IMPORTANCE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE IN MEDITERRANEAN AFFAIRS

Timothy E. Kalley
Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy
B.B.A., National University, 1989

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
June 2001**

Author: _____
Timothy E. Kalley, Student

Approved by: _____
Douglas Porch, Thesis Advisor

_____
David Spain, Second Reader

_____
James J. Wirtz, Chairman
Department of National Security Affairs

iii

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This thesis describes the benefits of maintaining United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean. It encompasses several themes to justify its point of view. It argues that the Mediterranean has been important to the United States for over 200 years. It describes the significant United States political and economic interests in the region. As the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) strongest member, the United States has a vested interest to ensure that the Mediterranean remains open and accessible.

Geographically the "Middle Sea" is an essential link between the Atlantic, the Persian Gulf and beyond. It forms a bridge across which three continents interact. But the Mediterranean's geographic configuration and complex political environment also makes it an operational challenge. Finally, the complexities and acrimony of Mediterranean politics calls for the United States Navy to support a variety of missions from "stability and support" to "small-scale contingencies" (SSCs) or potentially more conventional operations. However, the political, economic and geographic characteristics of the Mediterranean make it very difficult for military forces to operate there.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States has found it necessary to intervene in the Mediterranean to protect its own interests and the safety of United States citizens living there. From the late 18th Century, United States naval vessels began making frequent voyages to the Mediterranean Sea to protect American merchantmen under attack by Barbary pirates operating out of Tangier, Algiers, Tunisia and Tripoli. These states demanded tribute in return for safe passage through the Mediterranean Sea. However, by 1815 the United States had signed agreements with the Dey of Algiers and turned over the task of policing the Mediterranean to Great Britain's Royal Navy.

Mediterranean instability during the first half of the 20th Century saw a resurgence of United States Naval Forward Presence there. The kidnapping of influential Americans by the Moroccan bandit El Raisuni caused President Theodore Roosevelt to dispatch United States naval ships to Tangier at the turn of the century. However, the real resurgence of the United States Navy into the Mediterranean occurred during World War II, when the Mediterranean became important to the defeat of the Axis. The second half of the 20th Century marked the beginning of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. The focus of international attention on the Mediterranean forced the United States to accept its new leadership role in the Mediterranean after Great Britain acknowledged that it could no longer meet its commitments there. From this moment, the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps have intervened on numerous occasions in the Middle East, Libya and in Bosnia/Kosovo.

The Mediterranean's economic significance revolves around its value as a critical transportation route linking European trade to North Africa, the Middle East, the Black Sea and beyond. The Strait of Gibraltar, the Turkish Straits of the Aegean-Dardanelles-Bosporous and the Suez Canal connect the Mediterranean to vitally important areas of interest to the United States, NATO and its European Allies. Maintaining safe and unhindered access to the Mediterranean Sea via these strategically important entry/exit points allows global trade to flourish.

The geographical complexity of the sea itself is matched by the diversity of the landmasses it links. The desert regions of Africa are intermingled with mountains that ring the southern Mediterranean coastline. Europe's southern coastline is mountainous and indented. This means that sea lanes of communication (SLOCs) are more favorable than overland transportation routes that connect the eastern and western Mediterranean Regions as well as those that connect Europe to the Persian Gulf. In addition, Western Europe's land route to Iran and Iraq passes through the politically volatile and mountainous terrain located in the Former Republic of Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey. Likewise, the Maghreb countries of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia must transit across the politically unpredictable land of Libya to reach Egypt and the Middle East. Therefore, safety and freedom of navigation in the Mediterranean Sea is of vital importance to continued trade and economic prosperity of all countries in the Mediterranean Region, and beyond.

Because one is never far from land in the Mediterranean, operating there is inherently risky for naval forces. Terrorist attacks are more likely when the target is operating in littoral waters near the terrorist's base of operations. Weapons development

technology allows wealthy nations as well as poorer ones and terrorists to possess missiles loaded with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Even relatively low-level technological weapons like the explosive boat used against the *USS Cole* pose threats to the United States ships forward deployed to the greater Mediterranean region. Additionally, the risk of incidents and mistakes by United States forward deployed forces is increased when operating within a heavily trafficked and politically volatile littoral environment.

The importance of maintaining United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean should not be underestimated. Political and economic upheaval in the Mediterranean Region requires continued engagement by United States naval forces to deter rogue nations from exercising terrorist agendas. United States naval forces currently possess the ability successfully to operate within the littoral reaches of the Mediterranean, but they must maintain their technological edge safely to continue the mission. New ships such as the DD-21, loaded with new and improved offensive and defensive gun and missile systems are a step in the right direction. Connecting DD-21's to the Aegis equipped cruisers and destroyers, as well as the E-2C Hawkeye, via Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC) will enhance this capability and expand the defensive umbrella necessary to defend against high-speed cruise missile and ballistic missile threats that surround the littoral environment.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I.   INTRODUCTION

This thesis describes the benefits of maintaining United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean. It will encompass several themes to justify its point of view. First, it will argue that the Mediterranean has been important to the United States since President Thomas Jefferson in 1801 first sent the U.S. Navy to clean out nests of North African pirates and so allow U.S. merchant ships unimpeded freedom to trade. Next, it will assert the perhaps obvious, but sometimes-overlooked, point that the United States continues to have significant political and economic interests in the region. United States Naval Forward Presence signals to our Mediterranean and NATO allies their strategic importance to the United States. It also acts as a deterrent to regional instability. As the strongest NATO member, the United States has a vested interest to ensure that Europe's southern flank maintains its political stability and economic viability. Maintaining regional stability is the main reason for the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps to remain engaged with our NATO partners in policing the region. In this way, the Mediterranean, which is a vital channel for the world's commerce, will remain open and accessible.

The Mediterranean's unique geography is the third theme of this thesis. Geographically the "Middle Sea" is more than a self-contained lake. On the contrary, it is a passage, an essential link between the Atlantic and the Persian Gulf and beyond. It forms a bridge across which three continents interact. The Straits and the Black Sea offer a back door to Southeastern Europe and Central Asia. In short, the Mediterranean's geographic position and configuration not only makes the Mediterranean a vital sea lane

of communication (SLOC) for the world, the Mediterranean connects us with many of our allies, and gives us access to some of our enemies.

But the Mediterranean's geographic configuration and complex political environment also make it an operational challenge, a fourth theme of this thesis. This is a challenge that the United States Navy, with the assistance of our NATO allies, is uniquely configured to embrace. The Mediterranean is the ultimate littoral environment, "like putting one's head into a bag," as U.S. planners complained during World War II.[1] Navies there never operate far from land, and thus are potentially vulnerable to land-based air and missile strikes. At the same time, in the Mediterranean, one is never far from more-or-less secure bases. The complexities and acrimony of Mediterranean politics, a fifth theme, calls for the United States Navy to support a variety of missions, from "stability and support" to "small-scale contingencies" (SSCs) or potentially more conventional operations. Thus, the politics, economics, and geography of the Mediterranean make this region both vital to the interests of the United States and its allies as well as a complex operational environment for military forces.

A.   POLITICAL VOLATILITY OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION

The political volatility of a region where the United States continues to have significant National interests suggests U.S. Naval Forward Presence cannot be withdrawn from the region. The sources of tension in the greater Mediterranean basin are legion.

1.   Middle East

Tension between Jews and Arabs has existed for at least a century and shows no signs of abating. The U.S. effort to find a partial resolution to the Middle East quagmire

---

[1] Playfair, I.S.O., *The Mediterranean and the Middle East*, vol IV, *The Destruction of the Axis Forces in Africa*, London: HMSO, 1966, 124.

remains a prominent feature of current and future Presidential foreign policy goals. President Clinton was able to assemble King Hussein of Jordan, Prime Minister Netenyahu and Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Chairman Yasir Arafat on 23 October 1998 for the signing of the Wye River Memorandum, which gave hope to the rejuvenation of the Middle-East Peace Process. However, the agreement was quickly handed significant setbacks following demands by members of Israel's fractured parliament that required the addition of new conditions to the accord.[2]

The current tensions between Israel and its Syrian neighbor revolves around the armistice arranged by the United Nations following the 1948 Arab-Israeli war. The agreement left the Golan Heights area under Syrian control, but that changed when Israel occupied the Golan Heights following the Six-Day War in June 1967. Additionally, they seized the high point on Mount Hermon to install sophisticated eavesdropping equipment, gained control of major water sources and created new Jewish settlements in the area.[3] Today, the hard-line stance of new Prime Minister Ariel Sharon has escalated the civil unrest between Israelis and the Palestinians, leading to continued death and destruction on both sides.

Resource issues are another source of contention in the regions. Discussions between Turkey and Israel regarding the sale of water from the Euphrates and Tigris Rivers to Israel have raised concerns with down stream countries. Water rights will likely cause increased tensions between Turkey and its Arab neighbors, Iraq and Syria,

---

[2] Hajjar, Sami G., "The Stalled Peace Process: Israeli-Syrian Track," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999, 315-316.

[3] Ibid, 323.

and signals one of the greatest concerns facing Middle Eastern and African countries in the future.[4]

2. North Africa and Libya

As in the Middle East, Islamic radicalism and Islamic extremism pose a constant threat in North Africa.[5] The ongoing insurgency in Algeria poses an additional security threat to its neighbors. The Algerian government is battling the insurgents for political legitimacy while attempting to shore up support both from within the local population and abroad.[6] Unfortunately, the Algerian government does not always seem to be firmly in control of its military, which is accused of brutally attacking its own population. Algeria has also recently witnessed outbreaks of discontent among the Berber Kabyles of Northern Algeria. Southern European countries like France, Italy and Spain are particularly concerned about instability in the Maghreb region, because this usually results in increased immigration as people flee from repression and turmoil in their own land.

Libya has remained relatively quiet since the mid 1980's. Nevertheless, Qadhafi should still be considered a major threat to security and stability within the region. Libya maintains an arsenal of Scud-B missiles that are capable of striking North African neighbors and some Italian Islands in the Mediterranean, not to mention United States ships in the area.[7] If Muamaar Qadhafi gains the capability to arm his Scud-B missiles or

---

[4] Blanche, Ed, "Water Binds Syrian-Iraqi Relations," *Janes Intelligence Review*, v. 13, no. 2, February 2000, p. 7.

[5] Larrabee, Stephen and Thorson, Carla, *Mediterranean Security: New Issues and Challenges*, RAND, Santa Monica, CA, 1996, p.viii.

[6] Larrabee, Stephen and Thorson, Carla, p.18.

[7] Kenneth B. Moss, "Strategic Choices in the Mediterranean: Europe, the Mediterranean, and the

those missiles carried by military aircraft with chemical weapons from his arsenal, this could seriously de-stabilize the Southern Mediterranean region. Additionally, Qadhafi supports Islamic extremists and has made known his intentions to develop or purchase a long-range missile platform that could easily reach Europe.[8] Qadhafi proved that he was willing to use his SCUD's in April 1986, when he fired at the United States Coast Guard facility on the Italian island of Lampedusa in retaliation for the U.S. strikes against his terrorist training sites.[9] Concerns over Libya's future capabilities led to discussions between United States and European leaders concerning the necessity of developing a ballistic missile defense system that could protect Europe from rogue nations possessing weapons of mass destruction.

3.   Turkey/Greece/Cyprus

Political disagreement between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus, territorial rights in the Aegean Sea and Turkey's acceptance into the European Union (EU) continue to fester. Greece gained EU membership during the 1980's and since then it has worked to delay the inclusion of Turkey into the EU. Greece's primary goal has been to gain direct control of the Aegean, and indirect control of Cyprus.[10] However, Greece's anti-Turkey tactics changed following the devastating earthquake that consumed much of Northwestern Turkey in August 1999, and caused many EU members to begin a

Middle East," *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, March 2000, available online: [http://www.cc.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/olj/meria/meria00_mok01.html]. Accessed 17 November 2000.

[8] "The Proliferation Challenge: Regional Capabilities, Intentions, and Trends." [http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/prolif/me_na.html]. Accessed 26 November 2000.

[9] Barletta, Michael and Jorgensen, Erik, "Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East," Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies. [http://www.cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/use.htm]. May 1999.

[10] Sezer, Duygu Bazoglu, "Turkish Security Challenges in the 1990's," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999, pp. 265.

fundamental re-evaluation of their views on Turkey. A series of bilateral agreements between Greece and Turkey have led to improved relations and negotiations aimed at enhancing increased tourism, economic and technological cooperation, maritime transportation, and fighting organized crime.[11]

4.   Turkey/Syria

Kurdish separatism threatens Turkish stability and threatens Turkey's chances of gaining entry into the European Union too. The Kurdish Worker's Party (PKK) has acquired sanctuary inside Syrian and Iraqi borders and carries out terrorist actions against Turkey from these locations. Actions by Syria and the PKK put Turkey and Syria on a collision course for war on 1 October 1998 following Turkey's strong warning to Syria to stop supporting the PKK.[12] Although the situation has been temporarily diffused, Turkey has not ruled out future military action pleading national self-defense.

5.   Balkans

Balkan instability has unsettled European politics since the region was ruled by the Ottoman Empire. Since the end of the Cold War and the breakup of the Soviet Union, Balkan politicians like Slobodan Miloševic have found it useful to reopen old wounds in order to stir up nationalism and ethnic hatred. When Slobodan Miloševic spoke to a crowd numbering one million people on 28 June 1989, the six hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, he re-opened the wounds that were healing among a

---

[11] Moss, Kenneth B., "Strategic Choices in the Mediterranean: Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East," *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, March 2000, available online: [http://www.cc.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/olj/meria/meria00_mok01.html] [accessed 17 November 2000].

[12] Sezer, Duygu Bazoglu, "Turkish Security Challenges in the 1990's," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999, pp. 270.

people ruled by other countries for so many years.[13] This began the unraveling of the Yugoslavian government, led Slovenia and Croatia to declare their independence from Serbia on 26 June 1991 and helped to instigate the ethnic cleansing and genocide in Bosnia and Kosovo.

These local crises have major regional implications, especially concerning the ongoing tensions between Greece and Turkey. If Macedonia had been drawn more deeply into the Kosovo crisis, Turkey may have been tempted to assist large Muslim populations there. Undoubtedly, this would have drawn negative responses from Greece, Bulgaria and Serbia because of their one time rule by the Ottoman Empire. This highlights the importance of the crisis in the Republic of Macedonia and reinforces why the United States was willing to become involved there during the early stages of the Bosnian campaign. Early United States intervention in Macedonia was seen as a way to guarantee United States involvement and prevent trouble from spreading to Southeastern Europe.[14]

B.   ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION

A significant amount of crude oil originating from Persian Gulf countries is transported through the Suez Canal enroute to Europe and the United States. The economies of the United States and its European allies greatly rely on safe and relatively inexpensive delivery of these fossil fuels. Therefore, the unimpeded flow of shipping throughout the Mediterranean Sea is of vital economic importance to the United States

---

[13] Judah, Tim, "The Serbs: History, Myth and the Destruction of Yugoslavia," Yale University Press, New haven, Connecticut, 1997, p. 164.

[14] Moss, Kenneth B., "Strategic Choices in the Mediterranean: Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East," *Middle East Review of International Affairs*,
[http://www.cc.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/olj/meria/meria00_mok01.html]. March 2000.

and its European allies. On any given day, there are approximately 250 oil tankers transiting the Mediterranean Sea. Thirty percent of the oil delivered into the Mediterranean Region transits through the Suez Canal with an additional seventy percent arriving at Mediterranean terminals via pipelines. The annual amount of oil moving through the Mediterranean Sea is roughly 360 million tons and nearly 300 million tons of this crude oil goes to Mediterranean countries.[15]

Throughout 1995, the energy supplied to Europe and the United States from the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) was consumed in greater quantities by European countries. In fact, during 1995 Western Europe imported 9.6 million oil barrels/day and 5.5 million of these were from MENA. The United States imported 8.8 million oil barrels/day during 1995, but only 1.8 million were from MENA.[16] However, the amount of oil that the United States acquires through the Mediterranean will see a dramatic increase if the proposed Caspian Sea oil pipeline comes to fruition. American and European oil companies are investing great sums of money to ensure that the Caspian Sea oil reserves are accessible via the Mediterranean Sea. Since Turkey is balking at the expected increases in oil tanker traffic through the Bosporus for safety reasons, an overland route dubbed the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan route would deliver the Azeri oil to Turkey's Mediterranean port of Ceyhan.[17] Additionally, an overland route would reduce the risks posed by operating large oil tankers within the very narrow Turkish Straits.

---

[15] "Oil Maritime Traffic." [http://wwwrempec.org/oil_traffic.html]. 21 April 2001

[16] Ragionieri, Rodolfo, "Europe, The Mediterranean and the Middle East," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999, p. 419.

[17] United States Energy Information Administration, "Caspian--Bosporus/Black Sea Issues," [http://www.eia.doe.gov/cabs/caspblk.html]. 10 May 2001.

The economic impact that U.S. naval forces have on the economy when they are present or sent forward to regain or maintain peace and stability in the Mediterranean Region is difficult to quantify. However, using the 1996 Taiwan Strait incident involving Taiwan's presidential elections and China's announcement that it would conduct live-fire exercises off the Taiwanese coast as an example, it can be shown that regional instability can prompt an economic downturn in European security markets and beyond. Hong Kong's Hang Seng index took a 7.3 percent dive at the height of the crisis on 11 March 1996, but quickly began to recover following affirmative action by the United States Navy. Positive reaction to news that the U.S.S. Nimitz would join the U.S.S. Independence in the Taiwan Strait to monitor Chinese live-fire exercises assisted with a rapid market recovery on 12 March 1996.[18]

Maintaining security of vital sea-lanes of communication (SLOC) is important to furthering free trade between the United States, Europe, North Africa and the Middle East. This has become increasingly true with the advent of the global economy. The United States, which has not relied upon export trade as much as most other countries is now starting to push for a larger portion of the world's export market share. Although the export trade figures are not huge, U.S. gross domestic product figures from exports increased from 7 percent in 1986, to 11 percent in 1996. United States trade with Eastern Mediterranean countries such as Greece and Turkey, now account for an average annual growth rate of 9 percent and Israel is up 12 percent per year.[19] Therefore it is important to maintain economic stability in the Mediterranean Region to guarantee that the free

---

[18] Goure, Dan, Mauldin, Dewey, and Kruel, John, "Naval Forward Presence: Present Status, Future Prospects," The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C., 1997, p. 55.

[19] Goure, Dan, Mauldin, Dewey, and Kruel, John, p.52.

9

flow of trade between the United States and its European trading partners remains uninterrupted.

C. GEOGRAPHICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

The geographical diversity of the Mediterranean Sea and the surrounding landscape reflects the unique make-up of the region. Covering an area of nearly 970,000 square miles, the Mediterranean Sea is a fraction of the size of the Atlantic Ocean's 31 million square miles. Adding the area covered by the Black Sea, which may have a profound effect upon Mediterranean commerce in the coming years, only increases the area to approximately 1.1 million square miles.[20] However, looking only at the small size of the Mediterranean does not do justice to its overwhelming importance as a major thoroughfare for military and commercial shipping interests. The Mediterranean Sea functions as the transportation hub responsible for connecting the Atlantic and Indian Oceans as well as the Black and Red Seas through key straits. The Strait of Gibraltar, the Turkish Straits of the Aegean-Dardanelles-Bosporous and the Suez Canal link the Mediterranean to vitally important areas of interest to the United States, NATO and its European Allies. The 1990's highlighted the strategic importance of maintaining secure logistical support for military forces of the United States and NATO Allies. During the Persian Gulf War, 95 percent of the supplies were delivered via sealift, and of those delivered, 90 percent transited from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean and finally through the Suez Canal enroute to the Red Sea and Persian Gulf.[21] These figures

---

[20] Shafir, Dov, "The Strategic Significance of the Mediterranean Sea," *Center For Strategic Studies, Paper number 15, Jerusalem Post Press, 1982, p. 5.*

[21] Larrabee, Stephen and Thorson, Carla, *Mediterranean Security: New Issues and Challenges*, RAND, Santa Monica, CA, 1996, p. 10.

emphasize the very reason why the United States must remain engaged in the Mediterranean Region to ensure our European allies security and to share in the economic benefits occurring from the new global economy.

From the western entrance at the Strait of Gibraltar to the western shores of Lebanon is over 2,000 nautical miles. Yet, the breadth of the Mediterranean Sea varies from approximately 500 nautical miles between France and Algeria, to less than 83 miles at the Strait of Sicily.[22] Considering an average speed of advance equaling 20 knots, it would take an aircraft carrier battle group (CVGB) or amphibious ready group (ARG) 100 hours to transit this expanse of water from east to west. The mean water depth is 4,900 feet with a maximum of 16,896 feet off the southern coast of Greece.[23]

Finally, the geographical complexity of the sea itself is matched by the diversity of the landmasses it links. The desert regions of Africa are intermingled with mountains that ring the southern Mediterranean coastline. Europe's southern coastline is mountainous as well and provides additional difficulty to the overland transportation routes that connect Europe to the Persian Gulf. In addition, Western Europe's land route to Iran and Iraq passes through the politically volatile and mountainous terrain located in the Former Republic of Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey. Likewise, the Maghreb countries of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia must transit across the politically unpredictable land of Libya to reach Egypt and the Middle East. In short, the lands that border the Mediterranean are, in reality a series of "islands", both political and

---

[22] Lewis, Jesse, Jr., *The Strategic Balance in the Mediterranean*, Foreign Affairs Study 29, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 1976, p.8.

[23] "Mediterranean Sea." [http://www.encarta.msn.com/find/Concise.asp?z=1&pg=2&ti=01989000]. 6 March 2001.

geographic, that the sea connects.[24] Therefore, safety and freedom of navigation in the

Mediterranean Sea is of vital importance to continued trade and economic prosperity of

all countries in the Mediterranean Region, and beyond.

---

[24] This theme is developed by Fernand Braudel, *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, vol. I, New York: Fontana/Collins, 1976, pp. 158-166.

II.   HISTORIC EXAMPLES OF UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN THROUGH 1945

From the end of the World War II to the end of the Cold War the Navy-Marine Corps team responded to some 190 crises around the globe, on average about one crisis-response operation every eleven weeks.[25]   In the Mediterranean Region, United States naval forces intervened on average every five months during this period.[26]   These crises ranged from numerous interventions in wars between Arab and Israeli forces, the Korean War, Vietnam, relief assistance following natural disasters, non-combat evacuation operations (NEO) and a quarantine around Cuba during the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962.   They are all examples of how United States Naval Forward Presence provided support to the many different situations occurring around the world. Approximately 80 percent of these circumstances required a CVBG, ARG, Marine Corps aviation units, land-based naval aircraft or a mixed composition of these units.

After the Cold War ended, it seemed likely that United States military involvement in crisis resolution would begin a steady decline. But just the opposite has occurred. Following the end of the Cold War, the aircraft carrier and amphibious ready groups intervened in 75 crises between 1990-1997.   On average, maritime forces responded to a different crisis every three and one-half weeks.   This tempo equates to naval forces being called upon more than twice as often as during the Cold War.[27]   The

---

[25] Hessman, James, "Forward-Thinking and Forward Deployed," Sea Power, v. 40, November 1997, p. 21.

[26] Dismukes, Bradford, *The Political-Strategic Case for Presence? Implications for Force Structure and Force Employment*," (Center for Naval Analyses, June 1993), CAB 93-7, p. 14.

[27]Hessman, James, p. 21

United States accepted its role as the sole remaining superpower during the 1990's and increased involvement in conflict resolution. However, American military involvement, and especially United States Naval Forward Presence in distant foreign regions, is hardly a new trend. On the contrary, United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean Region is an old story that began nearly 200 years ago, and one that testifies to a long-standing American interest in the region.

A.   SHORES OF TRIPOLI

Historically, the United States has found it necessary to intervene in the Mediterranean to protect its own interests and the safety of United States citizens living there. In the early 19th Century, United States naval vessels began making frequent voyages to the Mediterranean Sea, to protect American merchantmen under attack by Barbary pirates operating out of Tangier, Algiers, Tunisia and Tripoli. These states demanded tribute in return for safe passage through the Mediterranean Sea. Tributes increased the costs of operating in the Mediterranean and were viewed as a violation of freedom of the seas as well as an invasion of United States ships' sovereignty.

Although the United States paid its first tribute of 80,000 dollars for immunity from pirate attacks in 1784, the Dey of Algiers nevertheless confiscated two United States merchant ships in 1785. He demanded a ransom of 60,000 dollars for return of one of the ships and its 21 crewmen.[28] Although the United States did want the crewmen returned, the ransom was not paid until ten years later in 1795. The United States was interested in stopping piracy against its merchant fleet, so a 50-year Treaty of Friendship

---

[28] Schwalbe, David, "the Tripolitan War."
[http://americanhistory.about.com/homework/americanhistory/library/weekly/bltripol.htm.] 3 June 1998

was struck with Morocco in 1787. However, Portugal and Algiers signed a treaty in 1793 that allowed pirates from Algiers to enter the Atlantic Ocean via the Strait of Gibraltar. After the treaty was signed, Algerine pirates were allowed to pass westward through the strait and began confiscating American merchantmen and their ships for ransom. The culmination of these events led the United States to begin to develop a more robust naval force that could protect the United States' trade interests. Even so, by 1800 the United States had paid nearly 2,000,000 dollars or nearly 20 percent of the United States' income, in ransom and tributes to the Barbary States.[29] This was predominantly due the United States' inability to build enough naval vessels that could be forward deployed for protection of American merchant ships. Nor could the Royal Navy provide security because its mission of fighting the French caused it frequently to violate freedom of the seas by boarding United States merchant ships and impressing United States seamen into their navy.

The period of the wars of the French Revolution and Napoleon (1798-1815) were also a time when freedom of the seas was challenged. On 2 July 1796, the French government authorized United States ships to be seized if their crew list was inaccurate. This act alone caused the seizure of over three hundred United States ships in 1797 by French privateers. The X, Y, Z Affair in 1797 so agitated the Americans that it led to the creation of the Department of the Navy on 30 April 1798.[30] This incident occurred when President John Adams sent three representatives to France with the hope of signing a new

---

[29] Schwalbe, David, "the Tripolitan War."
[http://americanhistory.about.com/homework/americanhistory/library/weekly/bltripol.htm.] 3 June 1998

[30] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, pp. 28-34.

treaty of friendship and trade. However, three French agents identified as X, Y, and Z attempted to gain bribes from the three American envoys. When Congress found out about the French agents' demands, their severe reaction led to the birth of the Department of the Navy.

When Thomas Jefferson became President in 1801, he became so concerned with Mediterranean maritime security that he dispatched naval sloops to the Mediterranean to protect United States merchant vessels. Hoping to regain quick payment of overdue American tributes, the Pasha of Tripoli, Yusuf Karamanli declared war upon the United States. The result was the first Barbary War that began in 1801 and ended on 4 June 1805. This was the first combat experience for many famous American sailors such as Edward Preble, William Bainbridge and Stephen Decatur.[31]

Jefferson's investment in United States Naval Forward Presence paid its first dividend in September 1803 when Commodore Edward Preble obtained the Moroccan Sultan's promise to abide by the 1787 Treaty of Peace. However, Karamanli was more difficult to persuade, especially after 31 October 1803, when Captain William Bainbridge ran his ship, *Philadelphia,* aground and was unable to destroy it before the Tripolitans seized it. *Philadelphia's* capture set the stage for one of the most harrowing feats of bravery that occurred during this time. Following the orders of Commodore Prebel, Lieutenant Stephen Decatur sailed his captured Tripolitan ketch, renamed *Intrepid*, into Tripoli's harbor with his crew disguised as Moorish sailors. When a pirate aboard the *Philadelphia* questioned Decatur's Sicilian pilot about why he had entered Tripoli's

---

[31] Schwalbe, David, "the Tripolitan War."
[http://americanhistory.about.com/homework/americanhistory/library/weekly/bltripol.htm.] 3 June 1998.

harbor, the pilot explained that he had lost his anchor and needed to moor alongside a ship in the Harbor. The Tripolitans realized too late that this was a trick. The *Intrepid* pulled alongside the *Philadelphia*, disembarked its marines hidden below deck and set the *Philadelphia* on fire. The actions of Decatur and his men were heralded by Lord Horatio Nelson as, "the most bold and daring act of the age."[32]

But while daring, the burning of the Philadelphia did not end the war. In early 1805, Captain William Eaton, the former American Counsel to Tunis, devised a plan to overthrow the Pasha of Tripoli and replace him with his brother Hamat who was thought to be more conciliatory to United States interests. After convincing Hamat to return to Tripoli and remove his brother from power, Eaton assembled a force composed mainly of Greek and Egyptian mercenaries with a smattering of United States Marines that would march the 700 miles from Alexandria, Egypt to Tripoli to support Hamat's coup. Hamat, Eaton and a band of troops that eventually numbered 1,200 marched for 40 days and 40 nights. Arriving at the Tripolitan port city of Derna, they attacked the fortress with supporting fire from three United States ships. Having seized Derna, however, Eaton was in turn besieged by Karamanli's men. Eaton and his troops met and repelled continual attacks on Derna from the pasha's troops. The promise of money provided motivation for Hamat's troops to defeat the current pasha. However, Captain Eaton, Hamat, the American soldiers and Greek mercenaries quietly vacated Derna under the cover of night after they discovered that the current American Counsel in Algiers, Tobias Lear, had negotiated a peace treaty on 4 June 1805 with Karamanli. The new peace treaty would

---

[32] Schwalbe, David, "the Tripolitan War."
[http://americanhistory.about.com/homework/americanhistory/library/weekly/bltripol.htm.] 3 June 1998.

prevent Hamat from taking power.[33] Eaton and Hamat feared for their lives when they realized that the money they had promised would no longer be available for the assembled Egyptian soldiers. So, what did this episode illustrate? Naval forward presence and the seizure of Derna provided the pressure that allowed the new deal to be cut with Karamanli. But there were risks of defeat too. Also naval forward presence needed to be sustained for it to be effective.

The War of 1812 against Britain forced the United States to reduce its patrols in the Mediterranean Sea and allowed the Dey of Algiers to take advantage of the decreased American presence. Once again he extorted tribute from Americans and even threatened to detain American Counsel to Algiers, Tobias Lear. The second Barbary Coast War began when the United States declared war on the Dey of Algiers on 2 March 1815. Stephen Decatur returned to the Mediterranean in 1815 with ten ships to fight Algerine pirates and quickly scored a striking blow against the Dey of Algiers when he captured the Dey's finest man-of-war, the *Meshouda*. Stephen Decatur's quick capture of the flagship stunned the Dey and led him to sign an agreement stating that United States tributes would cease, no further United States ships would be captured, and captive United States citizens would be released. Additionally, most favored trading status was granted with the United States and the Dey signed a truce with the United States.[34]

Therefore, from our Republic's earliest days, naval forward presence was deployed in the Mediterranean to support United States interests there. Naval forward

---

[33] Schwalbe, David, "the Tripolitan War." [http://americanhistory.about.com/homework/americanhistory/library/weekly/bltripol.htm.] 3 June 1998

[34] Moss, Kenneth B., "Strategic Choices in the Mediterranean: Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East," *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, [http://www.cc.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/olj/meria/meria00_mok01.html]. March 2000.

presence was effective, especially when part of a general international effort. In this case, after 1815, both the British and French moved to subdue Mediterranean piracy, so that United States Naval Forward Presence contributed to an international movement to achieve regional stability. At the same time, these early wars against the Barbary pirates illustrated how influential the deployment of naval assets can be in this volatile and politically fragmented political environment.

After 1815, the Mediterranean naval squadron was created to make regular patrols throughout the region to safeguard United States fishing, whaling and ever increasing national trade throughout the world's sea-lanes. Port visits in the Mediterranean showed the flag and signaled America's interests within the region. The squadron even found opportunities to provide assistance to other countries and maintain regional stability. During the late 1820's, piracy re-emerged in the Eastern Mediterranean, as Greeks rebelled against their Turkish overlords, creating a climate of instability there. The United States Mediterranean Squadron's naval intervention against piracy restored calm to the Aegean Region.[35] Overall, the United States Navy's actions were relatively reserved within the Mediterranean throughout the latter part of the 19th century, basically because Great Britain adopted the role as guarantor of Mediterranean stability. This was especially true after the Suez Canal opened on 17 October 1869. From this moment, the Mediterranean ceased to be a lake and instead became an even more important passage for maritime trade. This was true for all nations, but especially for Great Britain because of their substantial interests in Hong Kong and India. Meanwhile the United States' naval interests focused more on Asia as Commodore Matthew Perry's opening of Japan

---

[35] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, p. 68.

to United States trade in the 1850's and the Spanish-American War of 1898 announced America's arrival as a Pacific power.[36] With Mediterranean political and commercial stability in the hands of the British and secondarily the French, the United States could concentrate its naval forward presence in Asia.

B.   EL RAISUNI AND THE PERDICARIS AFFAIR

Nevertheless, there were periods when United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean became necessary due to political unrest that directly affected United States interests. As the closest nation to Europe, Morocco was coveted by the 19th Century European Great Powers. However, none was able to absorb it into their colonial empires because Great Britain, France, Spain, and Germany could not agree among themselves who should take it over. As a consequence, Morocco was ruled for much of the 19th and early 20th Centuries by a weak sultan. Political unrest there continued to be a source of conflict because of Morocco's strategically important position on the southern shore of the Strait of Gibraltar.

Instability in Morocco revived a situation not unlike that of the Barbary Pirates of the late 18th and early 19th Centuries. In Morocco's case, these "pirates" were local warlords who were able to establish their authority in parts of the Sultan's realm and live by kidnapping and extortion. One such man was Sherif Moulai Ahmed Ben Mohammed el Raisuni who, in 1903, was released from one of the Sultan's prisons and soon began to take his place in Moroccan history. El Raisuni descended from a prominent Moroccan family that traced it lineage back to the Prophet, which gave him great status in Moroccan society. His life changed forever after witnessing a woman distraught with grief and her

---

[36] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, p. 95.

clothes stained in with the blood of her dead husband. El Raisuni took revenge upon the assassins of her husband and soon developed a very effective protection racket that flourished in the more lawless regions of the Moroccan state, which was most of them. His acts of bravery during battle were legendary and his success infuriated the political leaders of Tangier. This led to his eventual capture and years of imprisonment. This experience further accentuated his ruthless character.

Upon his release, El Raisuni took up the habit of kidnapping influential people in the hopes of gaining ransoms for their release. The celebrated English traveler and writer Walter Harris was one of his early captives and was used by El Raisuni and his tribesmen as leverage to try and gain the release of 56 captives held in Tangier's prisons. When the British minister insisted that the list was too large, the tribesmen threatened to kill Harris. However, Harris called their bluff and told them that the 56 prisoners would all be killed and burned over the next 56 days if he were killed. Harris was released after being detained for 36 hours. But this only spurred El Raisuni's desire to go after more important prey. [37]

Wealthy European exiles often chose to take up residence in Tangier because of its climate, a European diplomatic presence and its inexpensive living. Ion Perdicarus, an American citizen, was one of the wealthy expatriates living in Tangier with his family and soon became El Raisuni's next captive guest. Having just finished dinner on 18 May 1904, Perdicarus and his family were startled by the sound of gunfire and a scuffle. When Perdicarus and his stepson Cromwell Oliver Varley went to investigate, they were captured, bound and mounted on mules by Raisuni's men. Raisuni's demand for a

---

[37] Porch, Douglas, *The Conquest Of Morocco*, Alfred A. Knopf Inc., New York, 1983, pp. 107-111.

$70,000 ransom for the release of Perdicarus and Varley was considered shockingly high for the time. But even more innovative was Raisuni's demand that the American consul and British minister pledge that the conditions of the demand would be met.[38] The American consul and British minister fearing for their lives requested assistance from their governments. When President Roosevelt got word of the affair he sent immediate naval support in the form of six heavy cruisers. Roosevelt thought that Perdicarus was an American citizen and would not allow such atrocities to be committed against the United States. However, it was later brought to Roosevelt's attention that Perdicarus had exchanged his American citizenship for Greek citizenship to prevent his inherited property from being taken by the Confederacy during the American Civil War.[39]

Great Britain and the United States dispatched naval vessels to protect their diplomatic personnel and to provide a show of force that leaders believed would intimidate El Raisuni. However, he was not intimidated by the men of war twisting at anchor just off shore, and waited for the diplomatic entourage that would surely plead for the release of his hostages. Roosevelt's discomfort with the situation led him to make the kind of brash comment that he was famous for when he said, "Perdicarus alive or Raisuli dead."[40] However, he did have the strength of naval forward presence on his side and he used it as best he could. The presence of naval forces just off the coast did awaken most in Tangiers to the powerful capabilities that the Western powers possessed. Although it was land forces that would be necessary to defeat Raisuni, these troops would arrive by sea and receive supporting fire from the cruisers and battleships waiting nearby. More

[38] Porch, Douglas, *The Conquest Of Morocco*, Alfred A. Knopf Inc., New York, 1983, pp. 111-112.

[39] Porch, Douglas, pp. 112-113.

[40] Porch, Douglas, pp. 113-114.

important was the political effect that naval forward presence had on the situation, because Raisuni as well as the Western diplomats realized that Great Britain and the United States were willing to support their overseas missions. Additionally, the political success gained by Roosevelt's use of naval forward presence to intervene in Tangier guaranteed his nomination at the Republican convention later that that year.

French diplomats secured the right to conduct the negotiations with Raisuni, but all did not go smoothly. After the first negotiator's throat was slit because he was an enemy of Raisuni, it was difficult to find new volunteers. However, the sharif of Ouezzane, a holy figure in Morocco and hence exempt from political retribution, finally agreed to negotiate with Raisuni and secured the release of Perdicarus and Varley on 25 June 1904.

Raisuni's successes were numerous following the release of his captives. He rejoiced at the removal of his onetime rival, collected a seventy thousand dollar ransom and became the new caid of Tangier. The French profited too by being allowed to establish a French military presence in Tangier that was designed to train the Tangier police. Monetarily they acquired the exclusive right to negotiate loans with the Moroccan government and use customs receipts as security for their payment.[41]

C.   WORLD WAR II

World War II was the event that brought the United States Navy back into the Mediterranean Sea, and we have remained there ever since. The Mediterranean Sea was a pivotal area for British and United States intervention during World War II.   The Mediterranean provided the platform from which the Allied Forces launched their

---

[41] Porch, Douglas, p. 114.

campaign to defeat the European Axis. The primary benefits of applying allied intervention in the Mediterranean was that it:

- Supported Roosevelt's "Europe First" strategy.

- Developed a strong alliance between the United States and Britain.

- Revived France as an ally.

- Offered an alternative entry point into Europe for both land and air forces.

- Provided a place where Allied troops could gain combat experience at lower risk, and where Allied forces could identify their best commanders.

- Attacked the weakest member of the Axis alliance (Italy).

- Tied down Axis forces and prevented them from creating a strategic reserve to be used on the Eastern or Western Fronts.

Ultimately, President Franklin Roosevelt agreed with Winston Churchill and the British military leaders that priority should be given to the Mediterranean in 1942-1943. Roosevelt recognized that winning in Europe must be given priority over defeating Japan, even though many in the United States, including Admiral Ernest King speaking for the United States Navy, called for Japan's early defeat. However, Roosevelt recognized that he needed to support Great Britain and, above all, keep Russia in the battle against Germany. This required the Western Allies to open up a second front in Europe as soon as possible. Anglo-American ground forces needed to begin a ground campaign before the end of 1942, to show the Russians that the United States and Great Britain were its true allies. Entering Europe from the south after securing North Africa became the focus of allied forces and would provide an excellent opportunity for United States troops to gain valuable combat experience.[42]

---

[42] Parker, R.A.C., *The Second World War: A Short History,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997, pp. 117-118.

The tide of battle in the Mediterranean turned in August 1942 when British General Bernard Montgomery arrived in Egypt to launch a successful campaign that ultimately led to the defeat of German Field Marshall Erwin Rommel. The North African campaign relied heavily upon United States logistical and combat support. Additionally, fighting for control of North Africa provided a second front that effectively diverted Axis personnel, aircraft, tanks and submarines that might have been used more profitably on the Eastern Front, weakening Hitler's ability to conquer Russia. Operation TORCH brought United States and British troops ashore in French Morocco and Algeria on 7 November 1942, marking the allies' joint commitment to, as well as the revival of French participation in, the war.[43] TORCH also provided the environment that United States soldiers needed to season them for the brutal combat that awaited them on the shores of Normandy and the plains of Central Europe. Allied successes helped to ease French resistance toward the allies within the first days of Operation TORCH and bolstered allied attempts to push east toward Tunis.

During the North African campaign, the Axis relied principally upon maritime supply lines across the Sicilian Narrows to Tripoli and eventually Tunis. The allied ability gradually to constrict the Axis supply structure during the summer of 1942 significantly slowed Rommel's' advance eastward and prevented him from capturing Alexandria, the main base of the Royal Navy in the Eastern Mediterranean, and gaining control of the Suez Canal. This would have been catastrophic for British forces in Egypt who relied on shipments through the Red Sea and Suez Canal. British intelligence's ability to decipher German and Italian messages was one of the greatest contributing

---

[43] Parker, R.A.C., pp. 100-106.

factors that allowed British aircraft to intercept desperately needed logistics shipments for *Panzerarmee Afrika.* Additionally, control of the Mediterranean Sea prevented Hitler's forces from gaining access to vital oil resources in Iran and Iraq.

Operation FLAX, one of the most important allied operations conducted in the Mediterranean during the spring of 1943, spelled the death of the Axis in North Africa. Allied surface ships, submarines and aircraft reduced Axis supply ships enroute to Tunis to a trickle, a supply deficit that could not be made up by German transport aircraft. The losses attributed to Operation FLAX and the general offensive push toward Tunisia cost both sides very heavily. Germany suffered 155,000 casualties, lost 2,422 Luftwaffe aircraft and many pilots during the Tunisia campaign. Over 230,000 Axis troops surrendered in Tunisia in May 1943, a number that equaled in scale the Soviet victory at Stalingrad in February of that year. Additionally, there was a combined loss to the German and Italian shipping force equaling 506 ships. The losses suffered by Germany and Italy significantly contributed to "the unraveling of the defense of Fortress Europe."[44]

After the fall of North Africa, allied strategic priorities began to diverge. The issue that separated Churchill from the American, and indeed many of his British Commanders, was: how much more strategic benefit could the allies squeeze from the Mediterranean. The Americans were itching to get into the battle in Western Europe while Churchill believed that the Balkans offered the most promising avenue of attack. Churchill also reasoned that the Mediterranean was a British sphere of influence and

---

[44] Levine, Alan J., *The War Against Rommel's Supply Lines, 1942-1943*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, Connecticut, 1999, pp. 162, 180-181.

therefore if Great Britain could shore up its defenses around Europe's southern flank, they could repel Russia's future expansion southward, while protecting their SLOCs to the Empire. The initial compromise reached at the Casablanca Conference of January 1943 was to invade Sicily (Operation HUSKY). This would definitely clear the Mediterranean SLOC's and position the allies within striking distance of Italy. Operation HUSKY was launched in July 1943, the largest amphibious operation as yet attempted by the allies. Husky saw the birth of allied combined operations and was an important precursor to OVERLORD, the invasion of Normandy. In addition, Naval artillery was important to the survival of the American beachhead at Gela, and the advance of the 7th United States and 8th British armies along the coasts toward Messina. Despite clashes between Generals Bernard Montgomery and George Patton, HUSKY furthered the advancement of the most close knit and successful alliances in the history of warfare. The invasion also led to the overthrow of Mussolini and began the process that resulted in Italy's withdrawal from the war. In the Mediterranean, it was the precursor to the amphibious assaults at Salerno, Anzio, and ANVIL, the invasion of Southern France in August 1944.

The Mediterranean Region proved to be the pivotal region with regards to the Allied strategy of maintaining the "Europe First" policy. Many argued that the way to defeat the Axis powers was by immediately taking it to them on the plains of Western Europe. However, the Allies did not have the requisite equipment or experienced troops to carry out this campaign until 1943 or 1944. American naval commanders in the Pacific pushed to defeat the Japanese first, but Roosevelt realized that Britain and the Soviet Union must first be saved or the war in Europe would be lost. The Mediterranean

provided the theater where Naval power could attack Axis land power. By directing a concerted attack on the Axis supply lines from Southern Europe to Tripoli, the British and Americans were able defeat Field Marshall Rommel in North Africa and divert vital Axis reserve forces to the Mediterranean instead of the Eastern Front and the battles with Russia. Finally, the Allies were able to mount their offensive into Europe southern flank and make final preparations for the landings at Normandy.

Furthermore, United States participation in the Mediterranean established the United States and its naval forces in an area where each would play a vital and complementary role during the post-World War II world that continues to this day. The retraction of British power from the Mediterranean and communist dictatorship in Yugoslavia left the region without a stabilizing democratic protector until the United States accepted the role in 1947. This placed the United States Sixth Fleet at the southern reaches of the Soviet Union where it acted as a force for stability during the many crises that rocked the Eastern Mediterranean after 1945. These crises were a product of the founding of Israel in 1948 and the rise of Arab nationalism that destabilized the monarchies of Iraq, Egypt, and Libya. Finally, independence gained by former French and Italian colonies in the Levant and North Africa brought political uncertainty that threatened in some measure a revival of the Barbary Pirates. This new political situation required the constant vigilance of United States Naval Forward Presence.

III. MAINTAINING UNITED STATES NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

A. THE VALUE OF NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE

The formation of NATO in April 1949 provided a mechanism for the containment of communism. As the most powerful Western nation, the United States has assumed a leading role in the Alliance. Additionally, NATO's formation ensured that the United States would continue to forward deploy naval forces to the Mediterranean to reinforce Europe's southern flank an insure that the Mediterranean Sea continues to play its role as an important maritime passage. To do this, the United States was forced to take up a mission gradually relinquished by Great Britain after World War II. United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean Region provides many important advantages to the United States and our allies before conflicts erupt, during time of war, or in support of peacekeeping/making operations. Utilizing naval vessels and prepositioning ships operating in or near likely theaters of operation:

- Deters potential troublemakers.

- Reassures our allies that we are committed to the region.

- Prevents them from overreacting to situations.

- Provides the constant presence required to allow time for diplomatic solutions a time to work.

- United States naval vessels are sovereign U.S. territory and therefore are not subject to the same political constraints as land-based forces.

- Significantly reduces reaction time and transportation expenses for U.S. military response should conflict occur.

In 1947, the Foreign Office informed the United States that London would no longer be able to supply financial assistance to Turkey and Greece and intended to

remove British troops from Greece.[45] In the aftermath of World War II, the British were experiencing major defense commitments in India, Egypt and Palestine, as well as Germany and the Far East. Reacting to Civil War in Greece during May 1946, President Truman quickly accepted a new leadership role for the United States. The Truman Doctrine enunciated on 12 March 1947, marked the beginning of Washington's acceptance of a post-World War II global role for the United States. Truman promised $400 million dollars worth of relief aid for Greece and Turkey.[46] Furthermore, this began the practice of the United States, and eventually NATO, as a mechanism to restrain Greek and Turkish rivalry in the strategically important region joining the Black Sea with the Mediterranean.

Additional aid from the United States was allocated to a plan that allowed former European allies, neutrals and enemies in to regain economic stability. The Marshall Plan, activated in 1948 and named after President Truman's Secretary of State, General George Marshall, directed the majority of these funds to Great Britain and France, but other European countries benefited as well. Marshall Plan recipients collected a total of $13.2 billion dollars in aid. Stalin forbade countries controlled by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from participating in the program.[47] The retrenchment of Great Britain, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, and the emerging Cold War provided the political foundation for United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean.

---

[45] Keylor, William R., *The Twentieth Century World: An International History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996, p. 260.

[46] Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996, p.1063.

[47] Keylor, William R., p. 260.

The primary role of United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean Region is to deter trouble there, and during the Cold War there were ample opportunities to do this. Instability within the European and Mediterranean Regions occurred because of significant land grabs carried out against East European countries by the Soviet Union and the 1949 testing of their atom bomb. United States leaders grew concerned that the Soviet Union would soon push southward into the Mediterranean. Therefore, by 1951 United States fleet presence grew from 3 ships to 16 ships with one of these being an aircraft carrier. This number grew even larger to about 70 United States military vessels during the course of the Cold War, which also saw a surge of Soviet military ships in the Mediterranean. [48] Soon, the Mediterranean Sea became a focal point of tension between Soviet aggression and the United States' Cold War policies aimed at resisting Soviet expansion. Crises erupted, but from the end of the Greek Civil War, there was no attempt by the USSR, or one of its satellites, to seize a Mediterranean country, as they had in Central Europe with Hungary in 1956 or Czechoslovakia in 1968.

The United States' Naval Forward Presence has also deterred conflict, while promoting interoperability and cooperation between NATO allies Greece and Turkey. This has not always been an easy task. But continuing efforts to bind these two adversaries into the NATO alliance have made a difference. Interoperability exercises provide additional benefits by peacetime training of Mediterranean partners on how to execute NATO tactics, so that they can operate effectively to counter an adversary during an emergency. By engaging both countries in NATO exercises and security assistance

---

[48] Miskel, James F., US Post-war Naval Strategy in the Mediterranean Region, in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, p. 147.

programs, the United States has provided them with constant reminders that their NATO membership responsibilities override their national differences and impose common obligations.[49] Additionally, the United States Navy has allowed neither side to prevent United States aircraft or ships from operating in their zones of responsibility. "Meanwhile, Greece and Turkey have begun negotiations on a series of bilateral agreements affecting tourism, economic and technological cooperation, maritime transportation, and fighting organized crime among other things," writes Center for Naval Analyses Research Manager Henry H. Gaffney in 1995."[50]

Equally as important as maintaining interoperability and preventing overreaction to situations between quarrelsome NATO neighbors are the functions carried out by Standing Naval Forces Mediterranean (SNFM). Established in 1992, SNFM is comprised of naval forces from Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States.[51] This organization provides very important opportunities for military-to-military cooperation and oils the military mechanisms required to resolve diplomatic crises. The members of this alliance offer the valuable example of the cohesive teamwork required to carry out important cooperative operations like those conducted during Operation MARITIME MONITOR and Operation ALLIED FORCE.[52] Additionally, they conduct highly visible port visits and Partnership for Peace

---

[49] Gaffney, Henry H. Jr., *The U.S. Naval Contribution to Deterrence: What Has Not Happened in the World, and How the Presence of Naval Forces Contributed to Those Events Not Happening,* (Center for Naval Analyses, August 1995), CRM 95-139, p. 16.

[50] Gaffney, Henry H. Jr., p. 16.

[51] Yost, David S., "NATO's New Roles: Implications for the U.S. Navy," 31 August 2000, p. 39.

[52] Operation MARITIME MONITOR was NATO's enforcement mechanism used from July 1992 to June 1993 in support of the United Nations Security Council Regulation issued weapons embargo against Yugoslavia. Operation ALLIED FORCE was the air campaign carried out by NATO in support of the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1199 and to enforce compliance with the international peace

exercises.[53] SNFM capabilities could become more enhanced in the future and allow them to conduct non-article 5 missions (missions such as peacekeeping/peacemaking that fall under United Nations sponsorship, even though they may be commanded by NATO members) if they were provided necessary big-deck amphibious platforms and enhanced technical equipment such as Aegis radar equipped naval vessels.[54] United States naval forces assigned to SNFM can provide vital tactical training information to the other allied members. But the ultimate goal should be to work toward equipment improvements across the board for all participating countries. Without them the United States will be unable to communicate or operate effectively with its allies during times of conflict.

B.   ARAB/ISRAELI WARS

The Middle East has witnessed wars between neighbors since the end of World War II. United States Naval Forward Presence has been there to reassure our allies that we are committed to preventing situations there from escalating beyond the point of no return. Additionally, naval forward presence has remained within striking range of our allies' enemies and this has allowed diplomatic solutions a chance to mediate most situations there. Even so, the religious fervor that exists within the region has caused flare-ups that continue to threaten the Middle East Peace Process.

During what has been a series of wars and conflicts between 1948 and the current day, Israeli, Egyptian, Jordanian and Syrian armed forces have battled over strategic

plan drawn up at Rambouillet, France.

[53] The North Atlantic Council stated, "The Partnership will expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationships by promoting the spirit of practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin the Alliance." Yost, David S., *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security,* United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington D.C., 1998, P. 74.

[54] Yost, David S., "NATO's New Roles: Implications for the U.S. Navy," 31 August 2000, p. 41.

strips of land in the eastern region of the Mediterranean. The United States supported Israel during these conflicts by dispatching the Sixth Fleet to the Eastern Mediterranean, while the Soviet Union provided support to the surrounding Arab nations. Additionally, having United States naval forces forward deployed to the Mediterranean has ensured that Washington remains engaged both militarily and diplomatically to prevent any of the protagonists from overreacting to tense situations.

Egyptian President Nasser's actions during the 1956 Suez Canal Crisis caused considerable anxiety for the United States, Great Britain, France, and Israel. His decision to nationalize the Suez Canal and enact a series of tolls for its use was unacceptable to these countries.   President Nasser's primary motive was to raise funds to finance construction of the Aswan Dam on the Nile River. The United States and Great Britain decided to withdraw construction aid for the project after President Nasser persisted in his efforts to acquire Soviet weapons.[55] The United States was monitoring the situation via U-2 reconnaissance flights out of Turkey when they noticed the military build up of Israeli, French and British forces near the Suez Canal. This caused United States leaders to shift the 6th Fleet forces, operating near Crete, to the Egyptian coast. Such a pre-emptive move by pre-positioned ships was ostensibly designed to facilitate the quick evacuation of American citizens from Israel and Egypt should the need arise. Eventually, nearly 3,000 Americans were withdrawn from Egypt and Israel.[56] But, it also signaled

---

[55] McNeill, J.R., "Ecology and Strategy in the Mediterranean: Points of Intersection," in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, p. 374.

[56] Miskel, James F., "US Post-war Naval Strategy in the Mediterranean Region," in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, p. 153.

our continued interest in the region and our desire to force a diplomatic solution on the conflict.

Israel, Britain and France planned an invasion that would allow Israeli troops to attack Palestinian terrorists located in Gaza and the Sinai Peninsula. Having dealt with the Palestinians, the Israeli troops planned to continue toward Egypt. Next, British and French troops would then enter Egypt to act a buffer between the Egyptian and Israeli forces. The explanation for their actions revolved around French fears of losing monetary compensation from the canal and the Britain feared the loss of necessary oil shipments through the Suez Canal. Additionally, the French resented President Nasser's assistance of the Algerian *Front de Libération Nationale* (FLN) during Algeria's war for independence from France that began in October 1954.

The situation concluded with a United Nations cease-fire agreement that was forced upon the French, British and Israelis by United States led diplomatic pressure.[57] Because the Soviets and Nasser stood up to the NATO allies and Israel, the Suez Canal Crisis allowed President Nasser and the Soviets to gain prowess in the Arab world, while the United States and her NATO allies lost face in the region. Even so, the Israeli army proved that it had the capability to threaten Egypt and most likely could have beaten the Egyptian army had it not been halted by the UN mandated cease-fire.

June 1967 found the Middle East embroiled in yet another military conflict. Israel felt compelled to protect its rights to freedom of navigation when Egyptian President Nasser closed off the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping. This served as Israel's vital link

---

[57] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, p. 319.

to the Red Sea and important supply routes beyond. Israel saw this partial blockade as a pretext for war. Israeli troops quickly launched a simultaneous, pre-emptive attack upon Egypt and Syria in response to President Nasser's actions. Israel's success shocked the Arabs and humbled the Soviet Union ?   Egypt and Syria fought with Soviet weapons, directed by Soviet advisors and still were defeated by an Israeli Army greatly inferior in number.   The Six-Day War allowed Israel to establish new borders around newly conquered territory. The West bank of Jordan, the Golan Heights and the Sinai Peninsula provided Israel with strategically important positions from which they could maintain a watchful eye over their Arab neighbors.[58]

The next major Arab/Israeli War, the Yom Kippur War, was launched by Egypt and Syria on 6 October 1973 in an attempt to reclaim territory lost in the June 1967 Six-Day War. The Arab states also wanted to re-establish the homelands of 2.75 million Palestinian Arabs who had been displaced and who were living in squalor since the Six-Day War.[59] The surprise attack allowed Egyptian troops to over-run Israeli positions on the eastern side of the Suez Canal at the Bar Lev Line. After initial success both by Syrian troops in the Golan Heights and Egyptians at Suez, the Israelis mounted a strong counter-offensive that dislodged the Syrians and Egyptians.   What followed was a powerful surge into the Sinai Peninsula and across the Suez Canal, where Israeli forces threatened to destroy the Egyptian Third Army and take Cairo.[60]

---

[58] Miskel, James F., "US Post-war Naval Strategy in the Mediterranean Region," in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, p. 154.

[59] Keylor, William R., *The Twentieth Century World: An International History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996, p. 344.

[60] Lewis, Jesse, Jr., "The Strategic Balance in the Mediterranean," *Foreign Affairs Study* 29, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 1976, pp. 80-81.

Israel's successes caused President Nixon to increase all nuclear forces to DEFCON III alert status during the Yom Kippur War. President Nixon's actions were in response to Leonid Brezhnev's threat to use unilateral force to enforce the 23 October 1967 cease-fire resolution.[61] Although tensions were high and significant posturing was conducted around each other's vessels, the United States and the Soviet Union did not commit acts serious enough to begin World War III.

During the Arab-Israeli Wars of 1967 and 1973, American aircraft carriers were stationed nearby in the Mediterranean to deter the Soviet Union and other outside parties from interfering. Stationing the aircraft carriers in the Eastern Mediterranean near Israel sent a clear and unambiguous message to the Soviets that the United States would not tolerate direct military intervention on behalf of the Arab states. Even so, the Soviet Union was able to deliver Moroccan reinforcements into Syria via Soviet ships. To counter Soviet support of the Arabs, the United States flew replacement aircraft to Israel, utilizing a leap-frog technique that enabled the A-4 aircraft to land on carriers stationed along the route. Once on deck, the aircraft were re-fueled before re-launching them to continue their journey to Israel.[62] The ability of aircraft carriers, sovereign United States territory, to relay reinforcements was made even more important after Wheelus Air Base in Libya was lost during Muamaar Qadhafi's military coup of 1970.

The deterrent effect of United States Naval Forward Presence during the Arab/Israeli Wars cannot be underestimated. It was the direct pressure of United States diplomats, backed up by the naval forces present in the Eastern Mediterranean that forced

---

[61] Lewis, Jesse, Jr., p. 80.

[62] Lewis, Jesse Jr., p. 41.

the warring parties to the peace tables. Prepositioning the Sixth fleet in the region allowed this action to occur more quickly before the hostilities got too far out of control. Additionally, during the Yom Kippur War of 1973, United States forward deployed naval units and diplomatic engagement in the Mediterranean Region were responsible for preventing Israeli troops from destroying the Egyptian 6th Army or entering Cairo, thereby, ensuring that Soviet troops would not attempt unilateral intervention on the part of Egypt.

C. LEBANON 1958 TO 1983

Lebanon has been another area where United States Naval Forward Presence encouraged the de-escalation of violence and bought time for diplomatic solutions to prevail. During the Cold War, United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean grew as we strived to implement our policy of containment. There were radical forces within the Middle East and Mediterranean Region's that caused concern to Western leaders. Radical Islam was gaining popularity throughout the region and threatened the stability of our allies. Lebanon represented a rare situation in the Middle East, because its population is almost evenly divided between Muslims and Christians. However, Cairo and Damascus fanned the flames of Muslim radicalism with propaganda and cash, to incite Lebanese Muslim extremists to take up arms against their Lebanese Christian neighbors. Lebanese Muslims armed with Soviet weaponry quickly began to attack the Christian-led government. When Lebanon's Christian President Camille Chamoun questioned the United States Ambassador on 11 May 1958 about Washington's willingness to assist his government, he received a positive response. Following a revolutionary outbreak in Iraq on 14 July 1958, President Chamoun requested United States assistance. Twenty-four hours later, on 15 July 1958, United States Marines began

to land in Beirut. The landing met no resistance so that the marines soon controlled the city's harbor and the airport. United States forces peaked at around 15,000 men before they began a complete withdrawal that was completed by 25 October 1958.[63] Overall, fighting was relatively contained and only one Marine casualty occurred.

The Lebanese intervention served two purposes: first, it created an environment for talks between President Chamoun, United States Special Representative to the Lebanon, Robert Murphy, and the rebels to begin to resolve the crisis. Second, it reassured our allies that the United States was willing and able to protect them from invading forces or civil war with more than words. It enforced the Eisenhower Doctrine, which called for the United States to support any nation or group of nations that requested assistance through military intervention. Instability and civil upheaval in Lebanon gave the United States the opportunity to prove its commitment to the Eisenhower Doctrine.[64]

### 1.	The Limitations of Naval Forward Presence

American intervention during 1958 proved both operationally and strategically effective. However, the crisis-intervention carried out by United States Marines and naval forces during 1983 proved to be a failure for two reasons. First, the Sixth Fleet and multinational forces' ability to stop the violence in Lebanon was undermined by the changing political climate in Lebanon. Radical elements supported by the Soviet Union and radical Moslem factions had by 1983 created a political environment that was not amenable to reconciliation. Second, the American reluctance to intervene in foreign

---

[63] Cable, James, *Gunboat Diplomacy, 1919-1991*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994, pp. 54-59.

[64] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, p. 322.

conflicts as the result of the experience of the Vietnam War was after the United States Marines Corps barracks bombing tragedy. This precipitated the United States withdrawal from Lebanon. The American people were simply unwilling to pay a high price for Lebanese political stability.

President Reagan was determined to assist the Lebanese Army in removing members of the PLO, Syrians and Israelis from Lebanon and the mission initially progressed with minimal casualties. United States Marines were part of a multinational force that evacuated over 12,000 PLO members from Lebanon before they themselves departed on 10 September 1982. However, when newly elected Lebanese President, Bashir Gemayel, was assassinated on 14 September 1982, the marines were again landed in Lebanon to insure stability.

When Syrian backed Moslem rebels began firing upon members of the multinational force, the United States naval forces began a Naval bombardment of the rebel positions in support of Lebanese Army units. President Reagan decided to employ 40-year old naval artillery that many criticized as antiquated during a time when nuclear weapons were the rule. After the United States Navy's battle ship *New Jersey* arrived on station with its 16-inch guns and 2,000-pound shells, a shaky cease-fire was almost immediately achieved.

In 1982, United States Marines met much greater resistance from rebel Moslem fanatics than they had during their 1958 mission to Lebanon. The primary reason for increased resistance was Israel's invasion of Lebanon, which effectively united hitherto divided Moslem groups into a coherent opposition. Armed with Soviet weapons, trained by Soviet military personnel and backed by Iranian money, Moslem extremists were

capable of mounting a more coordinated campaign of armed attacks and terrorism. President Reagan had promised PLO leader Yassir Arafat that the Israeli troops would protect the remaining Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon. But the Israelis looked the other way when Lebanese Christians killed nearly 800 Palestinians in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila.[65] President Reagan quickly returned the multinational peacekeepers to be near the camps. But this angered the Shi'ite Moslems who did not want long-term western intervention in Lebanon and who considered United States forces, not without reason, to be defacto allies of Israel. Multiple terrorist actions against the peacekeepers quickly undermined President Reagan's desire to remain in Lebanon. On 23 October 1983, a very large terrorist truck bomb detonated by a radical Shi'ite Moslem killed 240 United States Marines as they slept in their barracks. The French headquarters were hit by a second terrorist truck bomb that killed 80 French paratroopers.[66]

Although President Reagan made a valiant attempt to retrieve the situation by continued use of naval bombardment and a 28-plane strike upon Syrian air defense headquarters on 4 December 1983, the multinational force had forfeited the initiative in Lebanon to radical Shiite Moslems who had escalated the conflict beyond the threshold the multinational forces were willing to cross.[67] In the end, Sixth Fleet forces proved unable "to promote the interests of the United States in the Lebanon or to mitigate the

[65] Keylor, William R., *The Twentieth Century World: An International History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996, p. 365.

[66] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, p. 364.

[67] Hagan, Kenneth J., p.364.

sufferings of a people plunged into anarchy and chaos by the collapse of an artificial compromise that alone sustained the existence of a state that never became a nation."[68]

D.   LIBYA DURING THE 1980'S

Actions taken against Libya throughout the 1980's offer a prime example of how naval forward presence is employed to deter rogue states.   United States air strikes against Libya highlight another capability of naval forward presence. By positioning two carrier battle groups near the Libyan coast and supplying necessary striking power and Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses (SEAD) during the air strikes they provided critical offensive and defensive weapons capabilities required successfully to conduct strike warfare. Libya's belligerency attracted United States attention on 19 October 1973 when Libya's President Muamaar Qadhafi proclaimed that the Gulf of Sidra constituted an integral part of its territory under Libya's sovereign control.   In doing so, Qadhafi challenged the right to freedom of navigation within this area, which far exceeded the 12 nautical mile territorial sea claim contained within the rules of the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention.[69] This was particularly disturbing to United States naval forces that rely upon freedom of navigation to maintain safe and effective sea-lanes of communication. While the United States conducted a freedom of navigation exercise in the Gulf of Sidra on 19 August 1981, a Libyan jet shot a heat-seeking missile at a United States F-14 Tomcat operating from the *USS Nimitz.* This forced the F-14 and his wingman to the shoot down two Libyan jets.[70]

---

[68] Cable, James, *Gunboat Diplomacy, 1919-1991*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994, p. 61.

[69] Attard, D. and Fenech, D., "The Law of the Sea and Jurisdictional Issues in the Mediterranean," in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, p. 353.

[70] Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*,

During the spring of 1986, relations between Libya and the United States became increasingly antagonistic and led to serious military repercussions for Qadhafi. The United States was conducting exercises off of the Libyan coast with three carrier task forces in March 1986 when Libyan military forces launched six long-range surface-to-air (SA-5) missiles against American airplanes. Although no damage was done to the United States aircraft, two retaliatory air strikes were conducted against the missile launch facility at Surt, Libya. After this incident, President Reagan received information from intelligence sources that a bomb explosion at a Berlin nightclub in April 1986 was the act of a Libyan sponsored terrorist group. Two hundred people were injured, sixty-seven of them United States soldiers, and one United States soldier and one civilian died.[71] On the basis of this information, President Reagan authorized a retaliatory strike against Qadhafi. This was carried out by aircraft carriers in the Mediterranean Sea and United States Air Force F-111's launched from an airbase in the United Kingdom. The Operation named EL DORADO CANYON was designed primarily to damage Libyan leader Muamaar Qadhafi's terrorist functions operating from camps in Libya. President Reagan justified the operation on the basis of the United States' right of self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.[72] The operation encountered a serious obstacle when the French government refused over-flight authorization for the F-111's, which added 1300 miles to the trip each way. The United States was criticized by some for using such disproportionate force. But the air strikes effectively silenced Qadhafi

Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984, p. 357.

[71] Pike, John, "Operation El Dorado Canyon." [http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/el_dorado_canyon.htm]. 27 June 1998.

[72] Pike, John, "Operation El Dorado Canyon." [http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/el_dorado_canyon.htm]. 27 June 1998.

who has been a muted presence in the region ever since. Equally as important to the future of naval forward presence was the flexibility that CVBGs provided to military commanders when compared to land-based aircraft. The aircraft carriers successfully conducted their strike missions without the need to gain diplomatic permission beforehand, proving their value as sovereign United States territory.

E.   BOSNIA/KOSOVO

The flexibility of naval forward presence during the Bosnian and Kosovo conflicts, as against Gadhafi in 1981, was reinforced by the ability of the United States Navy to operate its aircraft from the sovereign territory of the aircraft carrier. United States naval forces provided the flexibility that NATO Commanders needed to hit a target quickly. Carrier based aircraft and Tomahawk Land Attack Missile (TLAM) missile launchers are well designed to accomplish this mission. Prepositioning the aircraft carrier battle group and stealthy submarines near Yugoslavia enhanced the rapid reaction time of naval forces. All of these factors reinforced the importance of naval forward presence and its ability to reinforce the NATO presence there. Forward deploying carrier battle groups to the conflicts added significant firepower in the region. Additionally, carriers provided important naval aircraft assets that operated independently of tenuous base agreements.[73]

The humanitarian disaster that resulted from the break-up of Yugoslavia starting in 1991 highlighted the absence of effective European institutional mechanisms for

---

[73] United States aircraft flying from Aviano, Italy experienced increased tensions with the Italians after a United States Marine Corps EA -6B aircraft struck the cable that was supporting a cable car in the Dolomite Mountains. The aircraft was flying a low-level training mission when its tail severed the cable, sending 20 people to their deaths. "20 killed as U.S. plane hits cable car wire in Italy." [http://cgi.cnn.com/WORLD/9802/03/italy.cablecar.update2]. 3 February 1998.

handling a crisis of this magnitude. The European Community's attempt to intervene was hindered by the inability of all members, notably Germany and France, to agree upon key objectives. Additionally, they lacked the ability to insert a multinational/European military force capable of bringing the crisis under control. NATO did have the necessary military muscle, but the United States' leaders were unwilling to become involved in the resolution of what they saw as a European problem.[74] However, it gradually dawned on Washington that the United States had a lot at stake in the Balkans.

The United States needed to regain the confidence of its allies and the brilliance as the leading military power of the alliance that it had won during the Persian Gulf War, but subsequently forfeited during the Somalia debacle. The United States was also searching for common interests with its allies that could justify sending United States forces to Yugoslavia. The introduction into Yugoslavia of United States forces was a gradual one. Initially the Unites States took an active role in enforcing the weapons embargo promoted by the United Nations. Later on, the United States came to view the prevention of NATO members Turkey and Greece from becoming embroiled in the Balkans conflict as a primary role of NATO's senior partner. But the most important reason for United States involvement was the leadership role that the United States still possessed within the NATO alliance and its recognition as the sole remaining superpower in the world.

United States naval intervention began with Maritime Interdiction Operations (MIO) during July 1992, in support of the arms embargo authorized by United Nations

[74]Larrabee, F. Stephen, "Instability and Change in the Balkans", *Survival*, (Summer 1992), p. 45.

Security Resolution Number 713.[75] The combined naval effort between the United States, NATO and Western European Union (WEU) allies significantly curbed the flow of arms to Bosnia via the Adriatic Sea. Two separate operations known as Operation SHARP VIGILANCE for the WEU and Operation MARITIME MONITOR for NATO and the Standing Naval Forces Mediterranean (SNFM) continued to operate for nearly four years. When the operation later named Operation *SHARP GUARD* was ceased on 18 June 1996, it had compiled roughly 74,000 ship challenges, with nearly 6,000 suspect ships inspected at sea and more than 1,400 being redirected to various ports for more thorough inspection.[76] Obviously, the advantages of naval forward presence were limited in this instance because NATO forces were unable to enforce embargoes on fuel, weapons or other shipments via overland routes.

United States aircraft operating from NATO airbases in Europe participated by delivering aid to refugees, while aircraft flying from USS *John F. Kennedy* and USS *Theodore Roosevelt* flew support missions over Bosnia to enforce the no-fly zone. During July 1992, Joint Operation PROVIDE PROMISE began as a humanitarian relief effort for besieged cities in Bosnia-Herzegovina.[77] United States Navy and United States Air Force aircraft were tasked to provide airborne protection for these relief flights.

Operation DENY FLIGHT was activated to enforce United Nations Security Council Resolution 816. The primary purpose of DENY FLIGHT was to inhibit Serbian

---

[75] Swider, Gregory. M., Hayes, Monica, Brown, Janice P., *Naval Contributions to Bosnian Operations* (Center for Naval Analyses, October 1995), CRM 95-101, pg. 7.

[76] "Allied Forces Southern Europe, Fact Sheet: Operation Sharp Guard." [http://fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/docs/SharpGuardFactSheet.html]. 26 April 2001.

[77] United States Navy, "1997 Posture Statement", [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/policy/fromsea/pos97/pos-pg03.html]. 20 October 2000.

aircraft that were supporting land battles over Bosnia.[78] These Serbian fixed wing and helicopter missions played a significant role in the ground war and disrupted the delivery of aid to refugees. Initially, the United States Navy carrier airwings were the only military units in the theatre with the capability to fly defensive and offensive air-cover missions for the United Nations directed aid flights that were air-dropping relief supplies. Therefore, Operation DENY FLIGHT was crafted so that United States naval aviation could enforce United Nations Security Resolution 816.[79] The flexibility and rapid response provided by United States Navy carrier battle groups were essential to the success of the operation.

United States naval aircraft were an effective force multiplier to NATO airpower in Bosnia and provided a deterrent that influenced the strategy of Serbian commanders. The sustained presence of an aircraft carrier in the Adriatic and NATO land-based aircraft flying from bases in Europe possessed the capability to strike targets far inland, thereby forcing the Serb Air Force to observe the no-fly zone. Additionally, surface and subsurface naval units loaded with precision guided Tomahawk cruise missiles remained in the Adriatic. Admiral Mike Boorda informed the Serbs that, "we knew where their weapons were and we told them we knew." The Serb Commanders had no choice but to remove their weapons from the United Nations designated safe areas, because otherwise they would be destroyed during future NATO air attacks.[80]

---

[78] Swider, Gregory. M., Hayes, Monica, Brown, Janice P., *Naval Contributions to Bosnian Operations* (Center for Naval Analyses, October 1995), CRM 95-101, pg. 21.

[79] Swider, Gregory. M., Hayes, Monica, Brown, Janice P., p. 21.

[80] Gaffney, Henry H., Jr., *The U.S. Naval Contribution to Deterrence: What Has Not Happened in the World, and How the Presence of Naval Forces Contributed to Those Events Not Happening,* (Center for Naval Analyses, August 1995), CRM 95-139, p. 15.

The event that finally led to NATO's offensive air power involvement in Bosnia was the shelling of the Markela Marketplace on 5 November 1995. According to Mark Danner:

> Sarajevo came under siege in April 1992 and continued to be shelled and sniped from the surrounding hills until the summer of 1995. Many important National buildings had been demolished and thousands of people had been killed or wounded during two years of incessant artillery attacks, but no day brought more attention to Sarajevo from the international community than 5 February 1995. When on this day a 120mm artillery shell exploded on the Markela Marketplace and killed 69 Sarajevans, the world finally took notice.[81]

The brutal massacre of so many people in a public place enraged Western leaders and finally led to the demand that artillery be moved back from the hills above Sarajevo. Small-scale NATO aircraft bombing raids were used to enforce this demand.

During the Kosovo conflict the United States' Representative Richard Holbrooke led efforts to initiate the peace process at Rambouillet. However, even after the Kosovar Albanians signed the agreement on 19 March 1999, Miloševic thumbed his nose at the deal.[82] The arrogance displayed by Slobodan Miloševic proved that the United States and her European allies could not force him to sign an agreement without actually resorting to the use of force. The NATO Commanders argued that the forthcoming bombing campaign would be quick and decisive. Miloševic however, believed that he could survive an air campaign, because his military chiefs optimistically thought that the Russians would provide Serbia with sophisticated missile systems that could knock NATO aircraft from the skies. However, when Operation ALLIED FORCE began on 24

[81] Danner, Mark, "Bosnia: The Turning Point," *The New York Review*, 5 February 1998, p. 34.

[82] Judah, Tim, *Kosovo: War and Revenge,* Yale University Press, New haven, Connecticut 2000, p. 233.

March 1999, it became obvious that conflicting signals were being sent to Miloševic from Moscow.[83] President Clinton added to Miloševic's confidence that he could survive NATO pressure by insisting, "I do not intend to put our troops in Kosovo to fight a war."[84] These public statements may have been aimed at reassuring the American public that there would be no repeat of Somalia. However, they were also transparent policy statements that steeled Miloševic's resolve to persist with ethnic cleansing in Kosovo.

In President Clinton's defense, his statement was undoubtedly made with the horrible vision in mind of what happened to United States troops in Mogadishu during the October 3, 1993 confrontation between United States Special Forces and Mohamed Farah Aideed's militia. During the unsuccessful attempt to capture Aideed, three United States Army Black Hawk helicopters were shot down, 18 Army Rangers were killed and 78 more were wounded. However, the most appalling vision brought home to American television viewers was the dead American helicopter pilot being dragged through the streets of Mogadishu as jeering crowds looked on.[85] This significant loss of life during a mission originally designed to help feed a starving nation forced the United States to rethink its position in Somalia and led to the withdrawal of United States troops there. Protecting the lives of Americans serving in future conflicts would now take precedence when determining how they would be employed. As in Lebanon in 1983, the value of the objective was viewed as too low and when the enemy raised the price beyond what the United States was willing to suffer, it pulled its troops out.

---

[83] Judah, Tim, p. 221.

[84] Judah, Tim, p. 269.

[85] Clarke, Walter and Herbst, Jeffrey, *Learning From Somalia: The lessons of Armed Humanitarian Intervention*, Westview Press, 1997, p. 132.

The conflict in Kosovo presented many political difficulties for the United States and its NATO allies. For one thing, everyone realized that it was impossible to get a United Nations Security Council Resolution passed regarding Kosovo over an inevitable Russian veto. Ultimately, NATO decided to defend Kosovo on the grounds of moral duty and bypassed the often-used United Nations Security Council Regulation. NATO Secretary-General Javier Solana emphasized what NATO saw as a moral imperative to take action.

> We have no quarrel with the people of Yugoslavia who for too long have been isolated in Europe because of the policies of their government. Our actions are directed against the repressive policy of the Yugoslav leadership. We must stop violence and bring an end to the humanitarian catastrophe now taking place in Kosovo. We have a moral duty to do so.[86]

NATO Commander, General Wesley Clark used this moral argument to convince the lone holdout, France, that striking Miloševic's Socialist Party of Serbia (SPS) headquarters was necessary because it was a viable military target. Although bombing of the SPS headquarters may not have been militarily significant, everyone came to understand that the attack did hold a symbolic importance. This was the beginning of NATO's attack on the heart of Slobodan Miloševic's political stronghold.[87] However, Miloševic proved resilient, and it took until 3 June 1999 before he was ready to begin peace negotiations. Armed with the knowledge that NATO was finalizing plans to begin a ground war and that the Russians would not come to his rescue, he capitulated. When the Yugoslav leaders realized that there was no room for negotiation during the meetings

---

[86]Judah, Tim, *Kosovo: War and Revenge* Yale University Press, 2000, p. 234.

[87] Judah, Tim, p. 233.

held in Blace, Macedonia, they signed the agreement. NATO bombing was suspended on 10 June 1999 as the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1244 which allowed the entry of NATO troops into Kosovo and guaranteed Yugoslav sovereignty. Additionally, over 1,300,000 refugees displaced by ethnic cleansing were allowed to return to their homes and villages from Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and areas throughout Kosovo.[88]

Throughout the conflict and following the suspension of bombing, the United States Navy and United States Marine Corps provided successful forward deployed support. Carrier based aircraft flew nearly 3,100 of the total 35,000 allied sorties during Operation ALLIED FORCE. Once the air campaign concluded, the *USS Theodore Roosevelt* remained on-station in the Adriatic Sea while NATO re-deployed its ground-based aircraft in late June.[89] Anthony Cordesman, Arleigh Burke Chair and Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, lists four major reasons why Serbia was ultimately forced to concede:

- The Damage done by NATO air and missile power and NATO's continuing ability to attack any target with impunity,

- The fact that Serbia alienated most of the world by its ethnic cleansing and lost all political support,

- Serbia's inability to defeat the ground operations of the Kosovo Liberation Army without exposing its forces to devastating air attack, and,

- The growing prospect that NATO would pursue a ground option if NATO air and missile power did not achieve decisive results.[90]

---

[88] "Progress in Kosovo Since the Conflict." [http://www.nato.int/kosovo/repo2000/progress.htm] 30 October 2000.

[89] Peterson, Gordon, "Cohen, Shelton Praise Kosovo Air Campaign; DDO to Review Results of Operation Allied Force." [http://www.navyleague.org/seapower/cohen_shelton_praise_kosovo_air_campaign.htm]. 5 May 2000.

[90] Cordesman, Anthony H., "The Lessons and Non-Lessons of the Air and Missile War in Kosovo: Executive Summary." [http://www.csis.org/kosovo/LessonsExec.pdf]. 20 July 1999.

Throughout Operation ALLIED FORCE, NATO's ability to maintain air supremacy with little loss kept the price in NATO lives low because few were shot down. This signifies one of the air campaigns greatest successes. Therefore, popular political support was maintained.

However, the actual success of allied weapons and their proclaimed effect upon Serbian weapons was not as overwhelming as initial NATO claims reported, because of problems associated with climate, altitude restrictions and terrain. There was at least 50 percent cloud coverage 70 percent of the time in the operating area. The 15,000-foot altitude restriction imposed for flight crew safety restricted the accuracy of precision-guided weapons.[91] The Serbs also proved to be very good at making decoys. It was unrealistic to expect NATO pilots flying 15,000 feet overhead to be able to distinguish between what appears to be an artillery piece, but was actually a log configured and camouflaged to look like a gun. This problem will likely be rectified in future conflicts by greater employment of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) by United States Navy, Army and Air Force units. Less costly than actual aircraft and even more so politically when compared to the loss of a pilot, UAV's can provide close-range reconnaissance and battle damage assessment for more effective weapons effectiveness assessments.[92]

Finally, the stark contrast between the relatively flat sea of sand during the Persian Gulf War and the mountainous, forested areas of Kosovo amplified the difficulty experienced by United States and allied pilots. Even though actual Serbian weapons did

---

[91] Cordesman, Anthony H., "The Lessons and Non-Lessons of the Air and Missile War in Kosovo: Executive Summary." [http://www.csis.org/kosovo/LessonsExec.pdf]. 20 July 1999.

[92] "Joint Statement on the Kosovo After Action Review." [http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct1999/b10141999_bt478-99.html]. 14 October 1999.

not suffer all of the losses claimed by NATO, they were rendered impotent during the conflict because Serbian forces realized that allied capabilities existed to destroy them. Knowing that NATO counter-striking High-Speed Anti-Radiation (HARM) missiles could lock onto their missile system radars forced Serbian missile controllers to keep fire-control radars on their SA-2, SA-3 and SA-6 missile systems shut down and effectively made them useless.

F.   DRAWBACKS TO NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE IN LITTORAL REGIONS

Despite the many advantages represented by naval forward presence, there are serious disadvantages as well. The primary disadvantage to large carrier battle groups operating in the littoral environment is vulnerability. The danger to CVBGs and ARGs is accentuated in regions like the Mediterranean Sea and other adjacent seas for at least four reasons:

- The Mediterranean Sea is a Confined geographic environment highlighted by choke points. You are never far from land, but operating here is a requirement because of the past and present conflicts occurring in the vicinity of the Sicilian Narrows near Libya, the Aegean Sea and the Adriatic Sea.

- The Mediterranean is an unstable political environment with flash points in North Africa, the Balkans, Adriatic and Eastern Mediterranean. Terrorist attacks are more easily accomplished when the target is operating in littoral waters near the terrorist's base of operations, versus blue water operations.

- Weapons development technology that allows wealthy nations as well as poorer ones and terrorists to possess missiles loaded with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Even relatively low-level technological weapons like the explosive boat used against the *USS Cole* (which is a revival of the Italian "pigs" used against Malta, Alexandria, Souda Bay and Gibraltar during World War II) can be an extremely effective terrorist weapon.

- Risk of incidents and mistakes by United States forward deployed forces is increased when operating within a heavily trafficked and politically volatile littoral environment.

The United States Navy must continue to develop weapons systems that exceed the technological advances of adversarial nations or it will become dangerously vulnerable to relatively inexpensive, yet potent weapons. China, Russia, North Korea and Israel have the technological capability and economic need to sell surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles to less prosperous and rogue nations throughout the world. Technological advances compound this problem and are making it easier for nations to convert conventional missiles into weapons of mass destruction.

The Mediterranean nations of Algeria, Libya, Morocco, Serbia, Syria, and Tunisia all possess some form of Anti-Ship Cruise Missiles. They range from the Soviet made SS-N-2 Styx and AS- Kennel missiles to French Exocet's and Chinese HY-2 Silkworms. These anti-ship missiles vary in effective ranges from 25 to 60 miles.[93] When they are loaded onto ships or aircraft, there is nowhere in the Mediterranean that they cannot reach. The anti-access capabilities embodied within anti-ship missiles make choke points at Gibraltar, the Sicilian Channel, the Aegean-Dardanelles-Bosporous and Suez Canal extremely dangerous for all shipping traffic. Operating in confined littoral waters against missiles with very small radar cross sections that make many anti-ship cruise missiles difficult to detect reduces reaction time for U.S. Navy ships to launch defensive weapons or maneuver out of harm's way.[94] Although some of the larger missiles may lack stealthy characteristics or sea skimming capabilities, they compensate for this with very fast closure speeds.

---

[93] "Countries Deploying only ASCMs." [http://www.cdiss.org/tabtechs.htm]. Accessed 8 May 2001.

[94] Radar cross section (RCS) is the measure of a target's ability to reflect radar signals in the direction of a radar receiver. The smaller the RCS of an inbound missile or aircraft, the more difficult that it will be for a radar to detect it.

Another growing threat within the Mediterranean is the proliferation of ballistic missiles with ranges up to 2,700 miles. Syria, and Libya have ballistic missiles that are produced in France, Israel, Russia, North Korea and China.[95] Gaining the capability to mount WMD onto ballistic missiles greatly compounds the possible instability throughout Africa, Europe, and the Middle East. Naval vessels transiting the Mediterranean would be at risk throughout the sea if coordinated efforts for targeting were employed by rogue nations. The ability to purchase positional data from commercial satellite systems with high resolution imaging capabilities will assist rogue nations and terrorist groups with targeting Sixth Fleet ships operating in the Mediterranean.[96] The addition of enhanced targeting data for anti-ship cruise missiles imposes an ever-increasing danger to naval vessels as well as commercial traffic transiting through littoral waters.

Proliferation of sea based mine warfare in the littoral environment can render technologically superior ships helpless. Plus, mines rarely leave a return address and this amplifies the difficulty of directing retaliatory action. There are three primary categories of mines in use today. They are bottom mines, moored mines, and drifting mines. Although drifting mines were banned under the 1907 Hague Convention, they were still in use during the Persian Gulf War. The USS Princeton (CG 59) was the first cruiser to be fitted with the advanced SPY-1 AEGIS radar, but it suffered serious damage from a relatively inexpensive floating mine that was likely dumped off of an Iraqi vessel during

---

[95] Said, Mohamed Kadry, "Missile Proliferation in the Middle East: A Regional Perspective." [http://www.onog.ch/unidir/1-02-eKadry.pdf]. Accessed 9 May 2001.

[96] Henry, Ryan and Peartree, Edward, Center For Strategic Studies Report on Naval Forward Presence: Present Status, Future Prospects, *The Future of Naval Forward Presence*, November 1997, p. 34.

the Persian Gulf War.[97] Bottom mines rest on the bottom in shallower areas where they can detonate by mechanisms that react to acoustic, magnetic or pressure changes near the mine. Moored mines are tethered to a cable that anchors it to the bottom. They float at predetermined depths and actuate after preprogrammed acoustic, magnetic or pressure sensors detect the correct target.[98] Naval mines pose a serious threat to military and civilian shipping, because they can be easily deployed near choke points, common sea-lanes, and harbor entrances.

Terrorism is another subject that represents difficult challenges for forward deployed naval forces operating in littoral waters, during port calls or re-fueling stopovers. The 12 October 2000 terrorist bombing of the *USS Cole* (DDG 67) in Aden, Yemen while it was making a refueling stop has escalated United States concerns regarding adequate anti-terrorism security procedures for all military units operating overseas. The attack killed 17 United States sailors and wounded 39 more. Damage figures on the *USS Cole* have been estimated at $240 million and are expected to take at least one year to fix.[99] This highlights the fact that even a very sophisticated platform like the *USS Cole* is vulnerable to low-tech weapons that are available to virtually any group. Additional incidents like this would put increased pressure upon the already thinly spread United States naval fleet.

Although United States military personnel have been attacked before by terrorists in places such as Lebanon and the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, the *USS Cole* incident

---

[97] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.114.

[98] Pike, John, "Mines." [http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/ship/weaps/mines/htm]. 12 December 1998.

[99] "Navy announces results of its investigation on *USS Cole* (DDG 67)." [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/news/news_stories/cole.html]. 19 January 2001.

awakened everyone who thought it was impossible for a terrorist bomb to inflict damage on a Unites States naval vessel. Reduction of the United States' oiler fleet from 30 during the Cold War to 21 today forces some ships to refuel in-port versus at-sea and this adds to the danger of operating in unfriendly territory.[100] It will take extreme measures to ensure that another incident like this does not occur while ships transit near the coast or when they enter/exit port facilities overseas. Ultimately, the threat of terrorism is changing the way that the United States Navy operates.

Finally, operating in heavily trafficked and politically volatile littoral environments increases the chance that mistakes will be made. During the 1967 Six- Day War, Israel accidentally attacked the United States' communication ship, *Liberty*, killing 34 people. The United States suspected that Egypt had carried out the attack, but Israel admitted its mistake in time to prevent a retaliatory strike upon Egypt by the United States.[101] In these situations, the reaction time available for ships and their crews to react is greatly decreased. Commanders are forced to make split second decisions based on information received from their own on-board sensors or from those of other ships and aircraft operating nearby.

The *USS Vincennes* (CG 49) and its Commanding Officer, Captain Will Rogers III, became caught up in another event that seriously strained already tense relations between the United States and Iran. Captain Rogers and his crew were engaged in an attack near the Strait of Hormuz against Iranian gunboats that had fired upon the

[100] Dunn, Michael Collins, "The Old Assumptions Crumble," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.54.

[101] Miskel, James F., "US Post-war Naval Strategy in the Mediterranean Region," in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, p. 154.

Vincennes' helicopters as they followed the gunboats back toward their port. Around the same time, an Iranian Airbus A300 took off from Bandar Abbas Airfield on a routine scheduled flight to Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Captain Rogers and his crew mistakenly identified this commercial airliner as an Iranian F-14 fighter. Combat Information Center personnel reported this to Captain Rogers and then reported that its AEGIS Radar showed an aircraft in a descent toward their position. This information combined with an Iranian P-3 maritime patrol aircraft flying near the coastline and the memory of what had happened to *USS Stark* when she was attacked by two Iraqi Exocet missiles, convinced Captain Rogers that he was under attack. Captain Rogers authorized an attack on his supposed assailant with surface-to-air missiles. Only later did he learn that he had, in fact, shot down a civilian airliner.[102]

---

102 Wilson, George C., "Navy Missile Downs Jetliner on 4th of July." [http://www.geocities.com/CaptiolHill/5260/july88crash.html]. 4 July 1988.

IV. CAPABILITIES AND MISSIONS OF UNITED STATES NAVAL FORCES FORWARD DEPLOYED TO THE MEDITERRANEAN

The CVBG developed in World War II and the ARG are both formidable weapons of war whose technical capabilities give the United States the ability to project power almost anywhere in the world. However, in the post-Cold War world, the CVBG and ARG have had to try to adapt to new missions. When crises occur, United States Naval Forward Presence offers a versatile support base to perform a variety of missions, among them:

- Pilot Rescue
- Reconnaissance
- Tomahawk Missile Attacks
- Amphibious Intervention
- Armed Intervention

A. TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES OF THE CARRIER BATTLE GROUP (CVBG)

The battles fought in the Pacific during World War II helped to establish the aircraft carrier as the primary building block for United States battle groups. Surrounded by a protective wall of cruisers, destroyers, frigates and submarine forces, aircraft carriers and their aircraft were able to project power toward an enemy over the horizon. Over the years, this battle group concept has been improved with continually evolving technological advances to the carrier aircraft, surface ships and submarines. Carrier battle groups have the flexibility to deploy from one theater of operations to another in a relatively short amount of time. When necessary, this provides the President of the United States the ability to back up diplomacy with significant military muscle.

59

Additionally, this battle group comes complete with its own logistics supply lines and politically sovereign airfield. The training carried out during pre-deployment exercises allows every ship of the battle group to practice for possible contingencies in their assigned theater of operations. Arriving on station already trained for the area provides local commanders with instant firepower and support on demand.

The typical aircraft carrier's embarked carrier air wing (CVW) is comprised of F-14, F/A-18, EA-6B, E-2C and S-3 fixed wing aircraft. In addition, various models of SH-60 rotary wing aircraft complement this fighting fortress. The battle group is normally comprised of a Nimitz or Kitty Hawk-class Aircraft Carrier, Ticonderoga-class Aegis equipped Cruisers, Arleigh Burke class Aegis Destroyers or Spruance-class non-Aegis capable Destroyers, Oliver Hazard Perry-class Guided Missile Frigates and Los Angeles-class or Seawolf-class Attack Submarines.

1. Basic Functions of Naval Assets

The F-14 Tomcat brings with it the capability to provide long range offensive and defensive air-to-air coverage for the carrier, precision strike capabilities when the Low-Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTIRN) targeting system is installed and real-time/near real-time combat photoreconnaissance via the Tomcat Tactical Air Reconnaissance Pod (TARPS).[103]

Newer and more versatile F/A-18 Hornets are all-weather strike fighters capable of covering the offensive and defensive air-to-air role, striking land or shipping targets with precision-guided munitions, attacking enemy radar sites with anti-radiation missiles

---

[103] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.162.

or protecting ground forces with close air support.[104] The F/A-18 Hornet is a step forward from earlier United States Navy fighter aircraft. It possesses the ability to fight its way to an enemy target, drop laser guided precision ordnance onto that target and then fight its way out using long-range or short-range air-to-air weapons. "On the first day of Operation Desert Storm, two F/A-18C's, each carrying four 2,000 pound bombs, shot down two Iraqi MIG-21 interceptors, then proceeded to deliver their bombs on target."[105]

The aircraft carrier based EA-6B Prowler provides SEAD coverage of enemy radar sites, HARM employment, communication jamming and electronic surveillance capabilities for the United States Navy, United States Air Force and Joint and Combined Forces. The Prowler's importance gained high level attention following the shoot-down of an F-117 Stealth Fighter over Kosovo. "After the shoot-down of an F-117 in Operation Allied Force, no military aircraft, including stealth aircraft, flew in the theater without a Prowler providing standoff jamming. Operations Allied Force and Northern/Southern Watch marked the largest deployment of Prowlers in the entire history of the EA-6B program."[106]

The E-2C Hawkeye Airborne Early Warning aircraft is tasked with long range detection of enemy aircraft or surface ships, electronic surveillance, command and control of fighter and strike aircraft and Airborne Battlefield Command, Control Center (ABCCC) duties. ABCCC is the newest mission for E-2C crews and it evolved during NATO's extended role in the Former Republic of Yugoslavia. Operation Allied Force

[104] Smith, Daniel and Valasek, Tomas, "U.S Forces in the Kosovo Theatre," Center for Defense Information, [http://www.cdi.org/issues/Europe/kosvforc3.html]. 9 April 1999.

[105] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.162.

[106] "Facts and Figures," p. 163.

was NATO's response to Serbian aggression against Muslims living in Kosovo. The air campaign responsible for halting the Serbian advances required an intricate network of modified C-130, E-2C and E-3 aircraft to integrate the varied missions flown by pilots from numerous NATO countries. The C-130 and E-2C carried out ABCCC missions that were responsible for coordinating target assignments and holding locations prior to an E-2C, E-3 AWACS or ground control station taking control of them for their assigned mission. [107] Properly employing an aircraft capable of controlling multiple mission areas is essentially a force multiplier to the CVBG and NATO Commanders. Commander Wayne D. Sharer emphasized the added value that the E-2C Hawkeye's sensor suite brought to the ABCCC mission:

> The crew of five on the E-2C's executed all the administrative functions of the ABCC while providing tactical input and direction to aircraft as the situation dictated (as presented on its displays through on-board sensors, reported data and data links). For Hawkeye crews, airborne warning and tactical control is a primary mission. This easily added a new dimension to a standard ABCCC mission. Essentially, we became a self contained Airborne Warning/Tactical Control-ABCCC platform. On any particular mission, crews were responsible for as many as 40 aircraft at a time.[108]

The S-3B Viking was previously tasked with anti-submarine warfare and anti-surface warfare duties, but more recently has been converted to fulfill airborne refueling duties for aircraft assigned to the carrier's airwing. However, the S-3B still maintains surveillance capabilities and offensive firepower. The Inverse Synthetic Aperture Radar can quickly build the sea surface picture so the CVBG Commander can visualize every

---

[107] Commander Sharer, Wayne D., "Command and Control: The Navy Way Over Kosovo," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, October 1999, p. 28.

[108] Commander Sharer, Wayne D., p. 29.

angle of the threat environment and make crucial decisions on Over-the Horizon-Targets (OTHT).

Two helicopter variants, the SH-60F and HH-60H Seahawk are typically employed aboard the aircraft carrier. The SH-60F is responsible for conducting surface searches that can detect and classify surface ships and subsurface searches that can detect, classify, localize and attack submarines. Secondary missions include plane guard duties during flight operations, search and rescue, Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR), communications relay and medical evacuation.

The shore based P-3C Orion has been a workhorse for over thirty years, fulfilling a variety of roles and missions. The basic P-3C is tasked with maritime patrols in support of naval embargoes, anti-surface warfare and anti-submarine warfare duties, while carrying weapons capable of attacking enemy targets in all three arenas. An ongoing modernization program is providing enhanced capabilities in the littoral arena. Improved acoustic equipment is designed to work in the littoral environment, making the P-3C more viable in the difficult mission of searching for submarines in areas of increased ambient noise and increasingly complex bottom topography. Additionally, P-3C aircraft are integrated into the Anti-Surface Warfare role by providing OTHT Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence (C4I) and offensive weapons to the littoral environment. Maverick missile carrying P-3C's were responsible for enforcing sanctions in the Adriatic Sea against the Former Yugoslavia Republic.[109]

---

[109] Janssen Lok, Joris and Starr, Barbara, "Orion hunt a different prey" *Jane's Defense Weekly*, Vol. 22, 12 November 1994, p. 26.

The aircraft carrier functions as a sovereign floating airfield capable of quickly transporting and repositioning airwing assets that make up one arm of the CVBG's power projection capabilities. Additionally, they act as the CVBG flagship and possess highly effective organic mission planning capabilities. Defense of the aircraft carrier comes in the form of airwing aircraft, NATO Seasparrow Missile System, Phalanx Close in Weapons System (CIWS). However, aircraft carriers rely primarily on surface combatants ranging from Ticonderoga-class Aegis Cruisers, Spruance-class Destroyers and Arleigh Burke-class Destroyers to provide the umbrella of protection necessary for the aircraft carrier's survival from enemy attack. These ships use surface to air missiles, Harpoon anti-ship missiles, and torpedoes to fulfill this role.[110] The majority of Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates have been updated with anti-air warfare capabilities that complement their primary role as an anti-submarine warfare platform.

Ticonderoga-class Aegis guided-missile cruisers are capable of tracking aircraft, ships, and surface, sub-surface and air-launched missiles targeted at the CVBG. Using long-range Standard surface-to-air missiles, Harpoon anti-ship missiles, 5-inch guns, CIWS and torpedoes, they can defeat these weapons and the platforms that carry them, thereby providing protection for the CVBG.[111] Installation of the Vertical Launch System (VLS) allowed Aegis cruisers to carry and successfully launch Tomahawk cruise missiles in conflicts ranging from Operation Desert Storm in the Persian Gulf to Operation Allied Force in the Former Yugoslavia.

---

[110] The United States Navy Fact File, "Destroyers - DD, DDG" [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/factfile/ships/ship-dd.html]. 30 October 2000.

[111] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.114.

Spruance-class Destroyers and Arleigh Burke-class Destroyers provide a variety of formidable services to the CVBG. Employing long-range Standard missiles, Harpoon anti-ship missiles, 5-inch guns, VLS launched Tomahawk cruise missiles and CIWS, both classes provide superior coverage to the carrier and surrounding ships. Additionally, using onboard anti-submarine systems and SH-60B Seahawk helicopters they provide a venerable wall of protection from the ever increasing submarine threat in the littoral environment.[112]

Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigates have the primary role of detecting, localizing and if necessary destroying submarines near the CVBG. Following the collapse of the Former Soviet Union, Anti-Submarine Warfare's (ASW) role did not diminished in importance, but the scope of the effort decreased except in the Pacific Ocean. However, numerous crises occurring within the littoral environment during the last decade have re-emphasized the importance and difficulty of the ASW mission. SH-60B helicopters provide the submarine search. Additionally, a Maritime Interdiction Operations role has evolved in importance since the United Nation's (UN) activated sanctions against Iraq following the Gulf War.[113] From the Persian Gulf to the Adriatic Sea, frigates have been significantly involved with this potentially dangerous mission.

Los Angeles and Seawolf-class attack submarines provide the capability to hunt mines, covertly gather intelligence from enemy coastlines, deliver special operation forces in platoon size groups, and protect the battle group from enemy submarines and surface ships. Additionally, carrying Tomahawk land attack cruise missiles gives

---

[112] The United States Navy Fact File, "Destroyers – DD, DDG," [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/factfile/ships/ship-dd.html]. 30 October 2000.

[113] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.120.

submarines a precision strike capability.[114] Attack submarines were responsible for launching Tomahawk missile strikes against Iraq during Operation Desert Storm and more recently during Operation Allied Force. During Desert Storm, attack submarines were able to launch their Tomahawks from the Red Sea and Eastern Mediterranean with aim points designated hundreds of miles away in Iraq. This capability earned the USS Albuquerque the nickname "sharp shooter" by providing 100 percent accuracy for Tomahawk missiles launched on targets within Kosovo.[115] Mk48 torpedoes, Tomahawk cruise missiles, sensitive sonar systems and stealth technology make attack submarines an important ally to the CVBG and coalition partners.

B.   TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES OF THE AMPHIBIOUS READY GROUP (ARG)

When the carrier battle group is accompanied by an Amphibious Ready Group, there will be an additional three surface ships, 29 fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft and 2,200 Marines from the Expeditionary Unit on board.[116] This provides commanders with an exceptionally powerful and flexible complement of Marines that can carry out a variety of missions.

The primary fixed-wing aircraft employed by the ARG in the battlefield are the AV-8B Harrier, two seat version of the F/A-18 Hornet and the EA-6B Prowler. The Hornet and Prowler are often deployed onboard an aircraft carrier or from land bases and the Harrier operates primarily from the big deck amphibious assault ships of the Tarawa-

---

[114] The United States Navy Fact File, "Attack Submarines – SSN," [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/factfile/ships/ship-ssn.html]. 7 November 2000.

[115] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.111.

[116] Smith, Daniel and Valasek, Tomas, "U.S Forces in the Kosovo Theatre," *Center for Defense Information*, [http://www.cdi.org/issues/Europe/kosvforc3.html]. 9 April 1999.

class LHA or Wasp-class LHD.[117] Marine Corps F/A-18s conduct forward air controller duties, collect tactical reconnaissance from the battlefield, carry out air strikes and provide close air support for Marines on the ground and carry many of the same weapons as the U.S. Navy versions. The EA-6Bs perform the same mission as those of the U.S. Navy's Prowlers. Vertical/Short Takeoff and Landing (V/STOL) capabilities of the AV-8B Harrier make it a venerable weapon platform, designated specifically to deploy aboard amphibious assault ships and support Marine Expeditionary Units, Special Operations Capable MEU(SOC). Plus, it allows Harriers to be forward deployed onto the battlefield without needing to build an elaborate landing facility.

Helicopters provide the U.S. Marine Corps MEU(SOC) with capable and reliable support throughout the inland battle space. The AH-1 Super Cobra is a flying gunship responsible for providing forward fire support and close air support (CAS) for Marines on the ground, directing naval surface fire support missions, attacking enemy armored vehicles and helicopters and conducting armed reconnaissance missions of the forward battle area.[118]

The UH-1 Huey helicopter is tasked with providing airborne command and control, armed escort, assault troop transportation, security and fire support for Marines on the ground and airborne forward air controller duties during CAS, mortar, artillery and Naval Surface Fire Support missions.[119]

---

[117] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p. 194.

[118] "Facts and Figures," p. 198.

[119] "Facts and Figures," p. 198.

The aging CH-46 Sea Knight and CH-53 Sea Stallion accomplish the primary battlefield troop transport and medium-lift requirements for Marine Corps weapons, equipment and supplies.[120] However, as noted before, they provide the MEU(SOC) with the ability to conduct Tactical Recovery of Aircraft and/or Personnel (TRAP) missions in support of armed Combat Search and Rescue operations.

The United States Navy and United States Marine Corps have a long-standing tradition of taking the fight to the enemy from the sea. Future capabilities that will allow them to project power further inland will hinge upon future budgetary restraints and successful development and employment of weapons systems that make them a fighting force second to none. The Post Cold War environment combined with American's distaste for loss of life in foreign countries where they see no shared common enemy made it difficult for military leaders to convince Congress that increased military spending was necessary during the 1990's. However, President George W. Bush and his administration team appear to be on the brink of proposing radical changes toward this downward trend in military spending. Even so, many Americans do not envision countries such as the Yugoslavia, Africa, China and Iraq as posing any direct threat to the United States in the near future. Nevertheless, in today's global economy, nearly all countries and their economies are interconnected and even small military crises can have an effect on the United States in some way.

---

[120] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p. 200.

C. MISSION ROLES FOR U.S. NAVAL FORCES FORWARD DEPLOYED TO THE MEDITERRANEAN SEA

1. Pilot Rescue

Tactical Recovery of Aircraft and/or Personnel is a critical mission area that the United States Marine Corps successfully fulfilled during the Bosnia conflict. After Captain Scott O'Grady's F-16 was shot down over Bosnia during an Operation "DENY FLIGHT" mission, he was rescued by a heavily armed CH-53 helicopter assigned to a Marine Expeditionary Unit Special Operations Capable MEU(SOC) conducting a Tactical Recovery of Aircraft and/or Personnel mission. [121]

Support for this type of mission comes from many different units operating within and outside of a country's borders. Special SEAL units operating covertly within a country's borders can locate a pilot and provide security in the area until TRAP personnel arrive. Additionally, Naval and Marine Corps forces offshore have the ability to provide CAS and Air Supremacy for rescue units. This support comes from a variety of fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft including the F-14 Tomcat, F/A-18 Hornet, AV-8B Harrier, AH-1 Super Cobra and UH-1 Huey.

2. Reconnaissance

Determining an enemy's current and future order of battle is obtained by a variety of means. Special satellites, aircraft, ships, submarines and human intelligence gathering techniques are employed to gather different types of vital information about the enemy.

U.S. Navy SEAL teams operating in 16 man platoons can be deployed around the world by a variety of means. Specially equipped submarines like the USS Kamehameha

---

[121] Siegel, Adam, Noer, John, Geis, Mark, "The MEU (SOC)s and the Kosovo Campaign: A precedent for the future?" *Center for Naval Analyses*, October 1999, CRM 99-131, p. 1.

(SSN 642) carry Seal Delivery Vehicles (SDV) that project SEAL teams onto hostile shores.[122]   These teams can be rapidly inserted into crisis areas and provide valuable human intelligence-gathering capabilities to collect tactical intelligence.

The EP-3E and P-3C aircraft from specially equipped Reconnaissance Squadrons are capable of supplying electronic and visual surveillance of the battlefield.[123] Employing electronic systems capable of intercepting unencrypted voice transmissions, the EP-3E takes advantage of vital real-time communications that can be used to build a situational picture of events unfolding within a country's borders. The Navy outfitted two specially equipped P-3C's with a long-range, electro-optical video camera system during the Bosnian and Kosovo campaigns, that allowed crews visually to monitor troop movements, arms storage areas, key bridges and other sites. Crewmembers were then able to conduct near-real time analysis of the video and provide this information to theater commanders.[124]   However, a recent midair collision involving a U.S. EP-3E flying a reconnaissance mission and a Chinese F-8 along the Chinese coastline underlines the vulnerability of these types of missions.

Finally, U.S. Naval surface combatants and submarines provide additional intelligence gathering capabilities. Sensitive antenna arrays allow surface ships to gather radio frequency (RF) emissions and route them to shipboard operators that can analyze them for information. Submarines use their stealth characteristics to gain access to

---

[122] Gourley, Scott, "Setting the Seal on Maritime Special Operations Forces" *Jane's Navy International*, Vol. 104, 1 June 1999, p. 18.

[123] Fulghum, David A., "U.S. Navy Reconnaissance Crucial in Albania, Bosnia," Aviation *Week and Space Technology*, [http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?TS=974483372&RQT=309&CC=1&Did=0000000113651] Accessed 17 November 2000.

[124] Fulghum, David.

sheltered waters near enemy shorelines and covertly loiter within range to intercept transmitted RF signals and additional emissions from our adversary's surface or sub-surface naval vessels. This ability to perform technical analysis or "hull teching" of underwater noises is vital during time of war. Matching naval vessels to their specific underwater signature aids submarine sensor operators in determining whether a vessel is a friendly or an enemy one. Additional intelligence about ships, port facilities and operating patterns of enemy ships is gained visually through a submarine's periscope.

3.   Tomahawk Missile Attacks

The United States Navy possesses the capability to launch long-range, extremely accurate missile strikes from most of its ships and submarines. The Ticonderoga-class Aegis Cruisers, Spruance-class Destroyers and Arleigh Burke-class Destroyers as well as the Los Angeles-class, Seawolf-class and Virginia-class submarines all carry Tomahawk Land Attack Missiles. Being able to launch TLAM's from ships and submarines at distances up to 900 nautical miles from their target removes the risk of losing pilots and their aircraft due to damage from surface-to-air missiles or enemy aircraft.[125] Additionally, Tomahawk cruise missiles need not require overflight permission from neighboring countries to cross their territory and alert the target. On the other hand, failure to gain diplomatic approval from neighboring countries for Tomahawk flights may elicit diplomatic protests.

In 1998, President Clinton authorized TLAM strikes from U.S. Navy ships operating in the Red and Arabian Seas against targets in Sudan and Afghanistan in retaliation for attacks carried out upon U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya.

---

[125] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.177.

U.S. officials say the six sites attacked in Afghanistan were part of a network of terrorist compounds near the Pakistani border that housed supporters of Osama bin Laden. In the Sudanese capital, Khartoum, the El Shifa Pharmaceutical Industries factory – which U.S. officials say also has ties to bin Laden and produces chemicals that can be used to make deadly VX nerve gas –was heavily damaged.[126]

The Tomahawk cruise missile provides the National Command Authority and Theater Commanders with a highly accurate weapon that sends a strong message to terrorists and adversarial leaders. This message clearly informs leaders that the United States and her allies have the capability accurately and quickly to conduct preemptive or retaliatory strikes from nearly every ocean or sea around the world.

Of course, the effectiveness of these missile attacks relies on accurate intelligence information. One potential disadvantage of these stand-off strikes is that they allow targeted countries to claim that the targets were misidentified or that the strikes resulted in civilian deaths and other collateral damage.[127]

4. Amphibious Intervention

The United States Marine Corps provides an extremely flexible and adaptable force that has proven to be very effective during recent conflicts in the Mediterranean Region. Tasking for Amphibious Ready Groups has grown rapidly over the last ten years. The United States Marine Corps' ability to provide deterrence and limited power projection has led to its involvement with Amphibious landings, Peacekeeping

---

[126] McIntyre, Jamie and Koppel, Andrea, "U.S. missiles pound targets in Afghanistan and Sudan." [http://www.cnn.com/US/9808/20/us.strikes.02.html]. 21 august 1998

[127] On 27 October 1999, Reporter James Risen printed a report in the New York Times that was based on interviews of key participants in President Clinton's Administration. The report appears to solidify claims that the Tomahawk raids on the Sudan pharmaceutical company called Al Shifa were conducted without complete evidence linking them to Osama bin Laden. Risen, James, "To Bomb Sudan Plant, or Not: A Year Later, Debates Rankle,"

[http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/Africa/102799us-sudan.html]. 27 October 1999

Operations, Noncombatant Evacuation Operations, Humanitarian/Civic Assistance Operations, and Maritime Interdiction Operations.[128]

The Marine Corps MEU(SOC) arrives in the theater of operations ready to conduct a variety of vital missions via ships of the United States Navy. MEU(SOC)'s deploy with enough supplies for 15 days of operations. The addition of a single maritime pre-positioning ship significantly increases the ability to stay in theater longer and even enlarge the forward deployed force.[129] Typically, three ships make up the Amphibious Ready Group that deliver the Marines and provide logistical support. These ARGs will consist of one Amphibious Assault Ship (LHA or LHD), one Amphibious Transport Dock ship (LPD) and one Dock Landing Ship (LSD) in each of the twelve Amphibious Ready Groups. They are capable of successfully handling the Marine Corps' future forward presence requirements.[130]

Amphibious forces have also increased their inherent ability to successfully carry out Humanitarian Assistance/Civic Assistance roles. The government of Bangladesh requested assistance following the devastation caused by a tropical cyclone in 1991. A twenty-foot high wall of water swept across the coast of Bangladesh and up to three miles inland. Upwards of 140,000 deaths and 1.7 million homeless were attributed to this tragedy. Advance support members from the III Marine Expeditionary Force arrived within 24 hours of the request for help. A fifteen-ship amphibious task force comprised of Amphibious Group 3 and the 5th Marine Expeditionary Brigade followed these liaison

---

[128] Siegel, Adam, Noer, John, Geis, Mark, "The MEU (SOC)s and the Kosovo Campaign: A precedent for the future?" *Center for Naval Analyses*, October 1999, CRM 99-131, p. 1.

[129] LCDR DeGeus, Stan, USN, *Joint Military Operations Reference Guide: Forces/Capabilities Handbook*, NWC 3153D, The United States Naval War College, January 1999, p. 39.

[130] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.122.

personnel. United States Marine Corps, Navy, Army and Air Force personnel meshed with multinational forces to provide food, water and medical assistance to nearly two million people.[131] This type of operation may require the U.S. Marines to provide security personnel for food shipments and to prevent civil unrest. But their primary concern is to assist with the distribution of food, supplies and medical assistance. Helicopters, personnel carriers, trucks and landing craft, air cushion (LCAC)'s give the U.S. Marines a great deal of flexibility, once ashore, to support a variety of missions.

Peacekeeping is another vital mission that United States Marine Corps amphibious forces have successfully supported around the world. However, peacekeeping requires exceptional military, logistical and political skills from the intervention force to know the proper mixture of force and persuasion to be applied. When refugees return home they are unlikely to be happy with their situation and there may be skirmishes. Tempers may flare as one group seeks revenge for violence done to it by its ethnic rival. But proper training can help to ensure that situations do not get out of hand. The 24th MEU(SOC) continually met the challenge of new roles during the Kosovo campaign. One of these new missions provided a reinforced company ashore in Albania to provide security to the Shining Hope refugee camp. Major Timothy E. Winand had this to say about the Marines of Landing Team 3/8, who served in Kosovo from June–July 1999, in his January 2000 Marine Corps Gazette article, "The Marines never surrendered the initiative to any member of the population, nor did they give the

---

[131] Naval Doctrine Command, *Naval Doctrine Publication 1: Naval Warfare*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1994, p.1.

74

impression to anyone, suspected criminal or upstanding citizen, that we were anything less than completely in charge of all situations."[132]

5.   Armed Intervention

Conducting armed intervention in the Mediterranean Sea is not a new concept for the United States Navy. However, there are major differences today that enhance the efficiency of U.S. Naval assets for this mission. The U.S. Navy can reposition itself much faster than in the past. Information exchange is so fast that decision-making can occur via video teleconferencing while commanders are actually operating in theater. The methods for delivering precision-guided weapons to a target have reduced collateral damage and increased the efficiency of those weapons. Although, faulty targeting information provided by human based intelligence sources can cause serious damage to diplomatic relations. For instance, faulty intelligence caused precision-guided weapons to be targeted against the Chinese Embassy in Belgrade during the Kosovo conflict. This example proves that no matter how accurate your weapons are, mistakes can happen unless your information is equally accurate.

More recently, the United States Navy combined forces with NATO allies to stop the atrocities being committed by Serbian armed forces against Kosovar Muslims. Ethnic cleansing directed by Serbian leader Slobodan Miloševic forced hundreds of thousands of Kosovar Muslims to flee to Macedonia and Albania. This in turn put a tremendous burden upon the governments of these countries.

---

[132] Major Sinnott, Anthony D., USMCR, "A Good Reputation is the Best Force Protection," p. 45, *Marine Corps Gazette*, June 2000.

The United States and our NATO allies threatened to take military action if Miloševic did not stop the ethnic cleansing. When it became obvious that Miloševic would not back down without the actual use of force, the air campaign began. The Kosovo air campaign, launched on 24 March 1999, opened with a heavy United States Navy cruise missile barrage aimed at degrading Serbian early warning radars and integrated air defenses.[133] The CVBG has very robust capabilities that can have a significant impact on the outcome of this type of armed intervention. Unfortunately, there were no aircraft carriers available for the first fourteen days of the Kosovo air campaign. When the USS *Theodore Roosevelt* and her battle group finally arrived, her airwing was handed immediate tasking. The versatility of Naval aviators to carry out missions without any time to acclimate to the new theatre of operations is an additional force multiplier to military commanders. Even though the USS *Roosevelt* and her air wing arrived two weeks after the beginning of the air campaign, naval air forces were credited with 30 percent of the validated kills against Serbian weapons of war used in Kosovo. This statistic is even more impressive when one considers that United States naval aircraft only accounted for 8 percent of the total dedicated aircraft deployed by NATO.[134]

Throughout the Bosnian and Kosovo campaigns, United States naval forces proved their worth by continually rising to meet new challenges. A classic example of this occurred during the Kosovo air campaign. The carrier airwing and Tomahawk cruise

---

[133] Morocco, John D. and Wall, Robert, "NATO Vows Air Strikes Will Go The Distance", *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, (29 March 1999), available from LEXIS-NEXIS. Accessed 20 October 2000.

[134] Vice Admiral Murphy, Daniel J., "The Navy in the Balkans," *Air Force Magazine*, December 1999, p. 49.

missiles were the only two systems that possessed the capability to plan a strike during the morning and strike the target later the same day. Podgorica airfield serves as a great example of the Navy's ability to react quickly. The United States Army's Task Force Hawk was preparing to enter Albania and the proximity of Podgorica airfield posed a danger to them. Additionally, the Serbs were moving significant ground attack aircraft into this airfield and storing them in an underground tunnel complex.[135] The following exchange took place between General Clark, General Short and Vice Admiral Murphy:

> When we detected that move, General Clark that morning said, 'I have to have that airfield taken out now. We cannot afford a strike, against Task Force Hawk just across the border.' He turned to General Short and said, 'Can you do it?' and General Short said, 'The Navy can do it.' This was on a video teleconference. He [Clark] turned to me and said, 'Dan, can you do it?' and I said, 'Yeah, we can do it.'… We put 48 airplanes in the air that afternoon and took out the entire airfield, including the underground tunnel complex that had 26 airplanes in it, and we emulsified every one of them, and [our crews] were home for dinner aboard the carrier.[136]

Surface ships and submarines were equally effective when receiving short notice Tomahawk tasking orders. The Serb forces used the nighttime to move their surface to air (SA-3) missile batteries around the country. The electronic intelligence gathering aircraft used electronic intelligence hits to find these SA-3 sites and then directed U-2 reconnaissance aircraft to the areas. When the U-2 verified that the area contained an SA-3 site, they would relay these coordinates to a Tomahawk missile shooter onboard one of the United States ships or submarines. Within forty-five minutes, a Tomahawk

---

[135] Vice Admiral Murphy, Daniel J., p. 49.

[136] Vice Admiral Murphy, Daniel J., p. 49.

missile would be on its way to the target. The Tomahawk kill rate was 85 percent for those targets that had the ability to be relocated.[137]

[137] Vice Admiral Murphy, Daniel J., p. 49.

V. THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES NAVAL FORWARD PRESENCE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

A. CONTINUED VOLATILITY

NATO expansion and EU enlargement are promoting a more democratic presence and a stabilizing influence in the Mediterranean. Nevertheless, the restrictive EU political perspective, its complex decision-making process that must take account of the interests of many nations, and the operational limitations of its forces place constraints on its abilities to act as anything more than a secondary stabilizing force in the region. Therefore, continued volatility in the Mediterranean combined with persistent vital U.S. interests there will require United States Naval Forward Presence for the foreseeable future. Fortunately for the United States, the capabilities of CVBG's are steadily improving, and are more than adequate to deal with Mediterranean crises within the political limitations imposed by the mission. Although CVBGs sometimes allow a gap in presence to exist when crises are not imminent, the ARG typically stays in the Mediterranean and can act as a stopgap to handle crises until the battle group can arrive. This chapter will review the actual, latent and potential crises in the Mediterranean, and then turn to the capabilities of CVBGs and ARGs to deal with those crises

1. Middle East

Since the beginning of Ariel Sharon's time as Israel's prime minister, the level of violence between Israelis and Palestinians has escalated and become practically permanent. Even before he assumed his new office, Sharon's visit to the disputed Temple Mount on 28 September 2000 ignited the latest cycle of violence that at the time

of writing, has so far resulted in 469 Palestinian and 84 Israeli deaths.[138] The offensive

actions carried out by one group serve only to invite quick and bloody retaliation by the

other.

The Arab League has demanded that its members sever all ties with Israel, but

Egyptian President Hosni Mubarek and Jordan's King Abdullah have been active in

trying to get Israeli and Palestinian leaders back to peace talks so that a resolution can be

enacted to stop the violence. However, Israel recently escalated the violence on 18 May

2001 when they used warplanes to strike Palestinian targets for the first time since the

1967 Mideast War.[139] In the past, United States efforts to bring the two sides together

for peace talks has met limited success. But finding a lasting agreement that both sides

believe equitable has proven to be elusive. So far, President George W. Bush's

administration has been reluctant to bring U.S. influence to bear on the conflict. But this

may change in the near future because of President Mubarek's and King Abdullah's call

for American assistance. Although naval forces deployed to the region may in the future

be used to enforce some kind of agreement between the two sides, it is more likely that

they would become involved in some type of non-combat evacuation operation or to

support a multilateral peacekeeping force.

2.   North Africa/Libya

Since the 1986 air strikes against Muamaar Qadhafi's terrorist training camps by

American aircraft, Libyan inspired and supported terrorism appears to have been quelled.

The one notable exception however was the December 1988 bomb that blew up Pan Am

---

[138] Fox News, "Egypt, Jordan Back Peace Efforts." [http://foxnews.com/story/0,2933,25206,00.html].
20 May 2001.

[139] Fox News.

80

Flight 103 over Lockerbie, Scotland. Libyans involved with the terrorist disaster were indicted by the United States and finally handed over by Qadhafi nearly ten years later, in return for the lifting of UN sanctions against Libya.[140] In November 1999 a shipment of SCUD missile spare parts was intercepted at London's Gatwick airport. The illegal payload was discovered on a flight bound for Tripoli via Malta on November 24, and reportedly included 32 crates of Scud missile components like those used by Iraq during the Gulf War.[141] Qadhafi has denied that the missile parts were destined for him. But his desire to gain improved ballistic missile systems is strongly suspected by the United States Central Intelligence Agency. The possession by Qadhafi's rogue regime of an updated missile system would have significant implications for the security of North Africa and the Central Mediterranean. While it is unlikely that a ballistic missile would be able directly to strike a vessel in the Mediterranean, this might not matter if the missile were loaded with WMD material. It is quite possible that United States forward deployed naval forces could be called upon to strike at Libya's underground chemical weapons making facility at Tarhunah, 60 kilometers southeast of Tripoli, if there is the possibility that Qadhafi may mount WMD material on his SCUD missiles.[142]

3.   Aegean

The Aegean region remains vitally important today as NATO reaches eastward toward the former Warsaw Pact nations. The Turkish Straits provide access to these countries and others surrounding the Black Sea. Maintaining peace and security there is

---

[140] Anti-Defamation League, "Update of Pan Am Lockerbie Bombing." [http://www.adl.org/terror/focus/17_focus_b_lockerbie.html]. Accessed 15 May 2001.

[141] Airwise News, "Scud Missile Parts for Libya Uncovered at Gatwick." [http://news.airwise.com/stories/2000/01/947421591.html]. Accessed 21 May 2001

[142] [http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/prolif/me_na.html]. Accessed 21 May 2001.

a requirement for military-to-military partnerships with countries like Ukraine and NATO interoperability exercises with Greece, Turkey, Bulgaria and Romania. Potential problems there include Turkish security, ongoing conflicts between Greece and Turkey, and the possibility of the spread of a Balkans war into the region.

Turkish instability and security problems revolve around relations with the PKK, a Kurdish nationalist group that began a campaign of terror against the Turkish government in 1984. The internal security problem has complicated traditionally difficult relations between Greece and Turkey, as Greece was recently discovered to have been facilitating the movements of one of the PKK's leaders, Abdullah Ocalan. Ankara's struggle against the PKK has also raised doubts in the minds of EU leaders about Turkey's suitability for Community membership in the near future. Additionally, the PKK problem has raised the possibility that Cyprus could be admitted to the EU before Turkey. Turkey points out that the international agreements that created Cyprus in the first place would be violated if Cyprus were allowed to join before Turkey.[143] Turkey sees itself as worthy of entry into the EU because it is a European country and because of its long-term NATO membership. It regards objections based on the PKK and the Cyprus issues as red-herrings raised by its traditional Greek rival.

Militarily, Turkey possesses a numerical advantage in terms of troops, compared to Greece. But Turkey also shares borders with Iraq, Syria and Kazakhstan, giving it the distinction of bordering on some of the most unstable territory in the Middle East. According to Duygu Bazoglu Seza, "The eastern Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf

---

[143] Sezer, Duygu Bazoglu, "Turkish Security Challenges in the 1990's," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999, pp. 261-269.

form a single entity with Turkey and Egypt providing a continental and maritime bridge between Europe and the Middle East."[144] Keeping Turkey engaged via its NATO ties could prove beneficial to boosting their self-esteem and get them re-focused upon their ultimate goal of EU acceptance. United States Naval forces will continue to play an important role in the Aegean region, because the tensions between Greece and Turkey are too easily inflamed and often require outside intervention to squelch them.

4. Balkans

The situation in the Balkans remains volatile. Slobodan Miloševic appeared defiant and intent on regaining control of the Serbian parliament during the recent 23 December 2000 elections. Even after the October 5 revolution that led to his removal from power after an overwhelming electoral loss to Vojislav Kostunica, Miloševic called the new leaders "traitors" and referred to himself as a "national hero."[145] The situation in Yugoslavia, as in the Balkan Region generally, remains unstable.

Macedonia, the entry point in the Balkans for United States ground troops during the Bosnian conflict, is now in turmoil as the result of the outcome of the Kosovo conflict. Albanians make up roughly 30 percent and Slavs comprise around 70 percent of the roughly 1.8 million Macedonians.[146] Albanian rebels who seek to create a "Greater Albania" are fighting against the relatively ineffective Macedonian Army. The rebel's attacks have led to Macedonian retaliation against Albanian villages to ferret out the

---

[144] Sezer, Duygu Bazoglu, "Turkish Security Challenges in the 1990's," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999, pp. 283.

[145] USA Today, "Milosevic has harsh words for new regime," [http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/nwssat03.htm]. 25 November 2000.

[146] New York Times, "A Trail of Misery as Macedonia Fights Albanian Insurgency." [http://ebird.dtic.mil/may2001/e20010518trail.htm]. 18 May 2001.

insurgents. As a result, 16,000 ethnic Albanian have fled to Kosovo.[147] Ironically, Macedonia became a haven for Kosovar Albanians during Slobodan Miloševic's ethnic cleansing of Kosovo in 1999. But this refugee influx placed pressure on the Macedonian state and helped to enflame ethnic tensions there. Although the numbers of ethnic Albanian refugees fleeing Macedonia has so far not been too large, they could grow if the situation continues and the conflict spreads. Meanwhile, the coalition of NATO peacekeepers remains on Kosovo's borders to prevent Kosovar Albanian rebels from crossing the border to incite insurgency in Macedonia. The importance of having United States Naval Forward Presence near the area has not been seen as essential. But naval forces could be called upon during a short notice strike mission if it was deemed necessary to punish offenders of the peace treaty between Kosovo and Serbia.

B.   FUTURE TECHNICAL DEVELOPMENTS

"Maritime Dominance is the naval capability that dominates the seaward extension of the littoral to provide joint and combined forces unimpeded access to areas of interest."[148] This is the future for the United States Navy and requires five fundamental elements to succeed: anti-submarine warfare, mine warfare, surface warfare, amphibious warfare and combat logistics.[149] There will be a variety of new and improved weapon systems coming online in the near future that will provide land attack capabilities to naval surface ships. These weapons will allow naval forces to raise the price of aggression; provide distant firepower to engage the enemy sooner over longer

---

[147] New York Times, "A Trail of Misery as Macedonia Fights Albanian Insurgency." [http://ebird.dtic.mil/may2001/e20010518trail.htm]. 18 May 2001.

[148] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Maritime Dominance," [http://surfacewarfare.navy.mil/n86/md.html]. Accessed 15 November 2000.

[149] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Maritime Dominance."

distances; enable massed concentration of fire without massing forces; and limit United States loss of life and collateral damage.[150]

Strategic choke points located throughout the Mediterranean Sea make it a potentially risky operating area during time of war. By using anti-access techniques near the entrances to the most critical transit points such as the Strait of Gibraltar, Strait of Sicily, Strait of Messina, Turkish Straits or the Suez Canal, naval vessels would be prevented from entering or exiting the Mediterranean Sea via the Atlantic Ocean or Black and Red Seas.[151] The weapons that can be used to prevent access to critical Mediterranean regions range from sophisticated sea-skimming anti-ship missiles to old technology contact mines. Anti-access techniques would have profound effects upon the United States and NATO's ability to enter the Mediterranean and provide support during regional crises. Additionally, the inability to deliver vital oil supplies routed from the Persian Gulf through the Suez Canal or Caspian Sea crude delivered by way of the Turkish Straits or the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan overland route would cause economic and political instability within Europe, Eastern Asia and the Middle East. The inability to receive necessary logistical supplies would put many ships at risk of attack from the countries controlling the entry/exit points to the Mediterranean and effectively tally them as a soft-kill, because they would be unable to participate in any crisis. Nevertheless, improvements in both offensive and defensive capabilities of United States Navy ships should allow the United States to continue to project naval power into the Mediterranean Region.

---

[150] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Maritime Dominance."

[151] Lewis, Jesse, Jr., *The Strategic Balance in the Mediterranean*, Foreign Affairs Study 29, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 1976, p.8.

1. Offensive Capabilities of United States Naval Forward Presence

Maintaining United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean will help to prevent aggressor nations from utilizing anti-ship missiles against military or civilian shipping.[152] Additionally, maintaining a forward presence in the region will show that the United States is interested in the region and cause rogue nations to realize that retaliatory strikes against them will make the cost of terrorism and aggression too high. Even so, the United States must continue to design and utilize new and improved offensive and defensive techniques to protect vital SLOCs.

United States surface naval forces combined with the carrier airwing, amphibious ready group and submarines will use four new weapons to influence and intimidate aggressors within the Mediterranean. These new or improved weapons are the extended range Tomahawk cruise missiles, Extended Range Guided Munitions, Advanced Gun System, and Land Attack Standard Missiles. Most Aegis Cruisers and Aegis Destroyers will be retrofitted with these capabilities. However, the new DD-21, 21st Century Land Attack destroyer is the designated platform for these weapons.[153] The Tomahawk cruise missile will introduce new technology that increases tactical responsiveness out to ranges of 1600 nautical miles.[154] New and improved Long-range Tomahawk's with exceptional accuracy will allow the fleet to progressively fight its way into a region that may be

---

[152] "Anti-access—also referred to as area denial, and in its original conception, as anti-Navy strategies—is the ability to deny U.S. forces entry to a region to conduct combat operations. In the worst-case scenario, a regional power could use a large inventory of relatively cheap ballistic missiles, potentially armed with weapons of mass destruction, to destroy fixed bases and any forward-presence forces within the region. Following the initial attack, the enemy could use ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, antiair defenses, submarines, and mines to prevent U.S. forces from entering through choke points or lodging on allied territory." Captain Sam J. Tangredi USN, "The Fall and Rise of Naval Forward Presence." [http://usni.usni.org/Proceedings/Articles00/protangredi.htm]. May 2000.

[153] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Maritime Dominance."

[154] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Maritime Dominance."

temporarily closed-off by aggressor nations. The Extended Range Guided Munitions will use a rocket motor and modified five-inch gun to increase the current range of naval surface fire support from 13 nautical miles out to 63 nautical miles.[155] Incorporating the Advanced Gun System onto DD-21 will extend on-call fire support out to 100 nautical miles with the combined accuracy of Global Positioning System and Inertial Navigation System.[156] This will provide a naval surface fire support capability with superior accuracy and redundant guidance systems to prevent collateral damage and friendly fire incidents. Finally, the Land Attack Standard Missile takes advantage of current technology embodied in the Standard Missile 2 (SM-2) and incorporates it into a 150 nautical mile surface to ground weapon with precision strike capability.[157] The last three weapon systems will be primarily used to support troops already onshore. But they can also be used to help destroy short-range surface-to-surface missile sites placed near crucial sea-lanes, once United States naval vessels have entered the area.

The United States Navy's ability to attack the enemy from below the sea will be enhanced by the introduction of Virginia-class submarines scheduled to join the fleet in 2004, and by Los Angeles and Sea Wolf submarines already in the fleet. The Virginia-class submarine will provide enhanced Anti-Submarine Warfare capabilities in both deep water and littoral settings. Various configurations will enable use of the Advanced SEAL Delivery System. Additionally, re-configuring the torpedo room will allow increased

---

[155] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Land Attack," [http://surfacewarfare.navy.mil/n86/sufires.html]. Accessed 15 November 2000.

[156] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Land Attack."

[157] Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Land Attack."

equipment and personnel storage spaces for SEAL teams.[158] New submarines and re-configured older models will be able to deploy new Unmanned Undersea Vehicle (UUV) technologies that are necessary to operate more safely in the littoral environment. This technology incorporated into the New Attack Submarine (NSSN) will allow submarines to deploy UUV's that can perform covert surveillance and intelligence collection and mine reconnaissance missions.[159] The need to create battle space dominance within a theater of operations is imperative to the safe and successful operation of the submarine force, CVBG and the ARG. A wide array of weapons will allow the NSSN to prepare the theater for this to occur. Employing stealth technology, advanced Tomahawk Land-Attack Missiles, Harpoon Anti-Ship Missiles, MK-48 Advanced Capability torpedoes, Special Operations Forces delivery and mine laying capabilities, the NSSN will help make the littoral environment a little less hostile to forward naval forces.[160]

Conditions beneath the surface of the Mediterranean Sea compound the inherent difficulties often experienced during anti-submarine warfare operations within a littoral environment. The presence of extreme thermal layering, varying bottom contours, underwater plateaus and sharply pitched seamounts make the Mediterranean Sea an ideal location for submarines to operate and hide. Naval vessels tasked with locating submarines will experience extremely difficult seawater characteristics for operating the active and passive sonar systems that comprise the majority of anti-submarine warfare equipment. The distortion caused by irregular bottom contours, high salinity content and

---

[158] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.111.

[159] Chief of Naval Operations, Submarine Warfare Division (N87), "The New Attack Submarine," [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/cno/n87/nssn.html]. Accessed 25 March 2001.

[160] Chief of Naval Operations, Submarine Warfare Division (N87), "The New Attack Submarine."

sun-heated layers that extend over 150 feet below the surface during the summer months, create a veritable submarine sanctuary that allow stealthy nuclear and advanced diesel-electric submarines to go undetected.[161] The addition of considerable ambient noise caused by commercial shipping traffic compounds the problem further.

The ARGs future success in carrying out offensive operations hinges upon deployment of the Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle (AAAV) and MV-22B Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft. "The MV-22B, the AAAV and the LCAC (landing craft, air cushion), will form the mobility triad that will enable the Marine Corps to implement its Operational Maneuver From the Sea (OMFTS) war fighting doctrine.[162] The Marine Corps has leveraged its future success upon the eventual deployment of the V-22B Osprey, because they would be able to move troops and equipment ashore from extended ranges at almost double the speed of current helicopters. Unfortunately, decisions on the V-22B Osprey have been postponed pending an investigation into recent mishaps involving loss of life. The AAAV will provide amphibious Marine forces with an extremely capable all-around system that can deliver forces ashore and then be used onshore to carry out its assigned mission. Its unique features include:

> 1) an inherent amphibious capability; 2) a top speed, at a minimum, three times that of the AAV7A1; 3) nearly twice the armor protection of the AAV7A1 without appliqué armor; 4) the ability to defeat future-threat light armor vehicles frontally at ranges of at least 1,500 meters while on the move and under conditions of darkness and adverse weather; 5) significantly greater cross country mobility and speed than the current AAV7A1, permitting operations with the main battle tank (M1A1); 6) two-to-three times the carrying capacity of comparable existing personnel carriers, such as the Bradley fighting vehicle and the light armored vehicle

---

[161] Lewis, Jesse, Jr., *The Strategic Balance in the Mediterranean*, Foreign Affairs Study 29, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, Washington, D.C., 1976, p.9.

[162] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.185.

(LAV); and 7) the only embarked-infantry overpressure NBC collective-protective system for a combat vehicle in the U.S. inventory. [163]

2.   Defensive Capabilities of United States Naval Forward Presence

Although offensive firepower will be important in defeating anti-access weapons, it is unrealistic to think that all weapons can be destroyed on the ground. Therefore, it is imperative that United States naval forces forward deployed to the Mediterranean possess the most advanced defensive weapon systems available. Network Centric Warfare systems will tie a variety of sensors into one commonly shared grid of offensive and defensive firepower. "Cooperative Engagement will allow large numbers of CEC-equipped surface ships and aircraft to operate as a single distributed air-defense system capable of passing fire-control-quality radar target measurements in real time to all ship and air units of the force."[164] Essentially, this means that an E-2C Hawkeye using its own long-range surface/air radar could provide targeting data to an AEGIS equipped cruiser or destroyer and enable that ship to fire long-range surface-to-air missiles upon an inbound missile and destroy it before its own radar system even detects it. Combining Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC) with sensors from the sea, air, land and space into a Navy Theater Ballistic Missile Defense (TBMD) will make the U.S. Navy capable of intercepting ballistic missiles as they descend and long before they appear over their intended targets.[165]   Additionally, employing these defensive weapons within international waters will preclude the necessity of wrangling over political and home country approval. In this way, the Aegis platform becomes a United States sovereign tool

---

[163] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.192.

[164] "Facts and Figures," p. 153.

[165] "Facts and Figures," p.156.

for defense against weapons of mass destruction that has the geographical flexibility of a CVBG.

The flexibility of United States naval vessels provides an added dimension to avoiding enemy attack. Because the CVBG can change locations at any time when operating in littoral areas, it decreases the vulnerability to anti-ship and ballistic missile attacks in a way that shore based military components cannot. However, as anti-ship missiles become more advanced and less expensive, it is becoming very important to find additional ways of detecting and engaging missiles at longer ranges. Supersonic cruise missiles intercepted and destroyed by close in weapons systems will create high-speed missile fragments that can still do damage to the defending ship and personnel.[166] One possible defense is to use "Street Fighter" techniques that combine the associated sensors of multiple ships, much like that of cooperative engagement, by using smaller ships carrying networked anti-submarine, anti-ship and anti-air weapons systems.[167] This configuration would allow littoral seas to be sanitized of submarines and mines before the main battle group arrives. After completing this task, the ships would remain to provide high-speed forward deployed air/surface missile defense along the expected threat axis. However, the drawbacks to this scenario are that these ships would need some type of mother ship to meld the information into a usable picture and provide refueling capabilities because of the relatively short endurance capability of the smaller ships. "Swarm tactics" would also prove important to preventing future suicide missions by

---

[166] Commander Skinner, Joseph E., "Swarm the Littorals," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, March 2001, p. 90.

[167] Commander Skinner, Joseph E., p. 88-90.

terrorist groups using small boats to deliver lethal amounts of explosives to ships operating in near-land littoral areas.[168]

Future mine-countermeasure (MCM) capabilities will become more important in littoral campaigns and require covert manned and unmanned searches for floating, bottom moored or buried mines that heighten the danger of operating within the littoral environment and to amphibious landings. In future mine warfare the U.S. Navy will integrate MCM systems from a variety of platforms. These include the CH-60S Knighthawk helicopter, Flight IIA Arleigh Burke-class DDG's, Avenger-class Mine Countermeasure Ships (MCM), Osprey-class Coastal Minehunters (MHC), and Los Angeles, Seawolf and Virginia-class submarines operating mine hunting UUVs. The most revolutionary MCM systems will be deployed within the next decade. "The CH-60 will be fitted with the AES-1 Airborne Laser Mine-Detection System (ALMDS), the Rapid Airborne Mine-Clearance System (RAMICS), an AQS-20X Sonar, an Airborne Mine-Neutralization System (AMNS), and the organic airborne and surface influence sweep (OASIS)."[169] Additionally, Flight IIA Arleigh Burke-class DDG's will carry and deploy the WLD-1 Remote Minehunting System. This semi-submersible minehunting system operates via remote control and possesses the means to detect, localize and identify mines, so that one or more of the mine neutralization systems can be employed against it.[170]

---

[168] Commander Skinner, Joseph E., p. 88-90.

[169] "Facts and Figures," p.156.

[170] "Facts and Figures," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001, p.157.

VI. CONCLUSION: THE CONTINUING IMPORTANCE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN TO THE UNITED STATES

The Mediterranean is a complex geographic, political and operational environment. Geographically, the sea must be seen not merely as a lake, but as a maritime passage that links the Atlantic, Southern and Southeastern Europe, North Africa, Central Asia, the Near and Middle East, and the Indian Ocean. It forms an important sea-lane of communication in both a commercial and a political sense. Commercially, much of the world's commerce, and many of its raw materials, are extracted from or flow through the Mediterranean and its tributaries. Politically, it offers one way, through forward naval presence that the United States can contact and support its allies, and punish its enemies, in the region. Therefore, it is vital to U.S. interests, as well as to those of the Western democracies and our allies, that this SLOC remains free of impediment.

Politically, the greater Mediterranean remains a region of extreme volatility. The Balkans and Southeastern Europe, North Africa, the Aegean, Central Asia, and the Middle East are all places where the United States has an interest in maintaining stability, fostering commerce, and deterring terrorism and war. United States Naval Forward Presence is one of our most effective and efficient ways to project our power and defend our interests there. One reason for this is that the U.S. Navy, through its CVBGs and ARGs, as well as other complex weapons systems, provides the flexibility and array of operational possibilities best adapted to this geographically and politically complex region.

The benefits of maintaining United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean Sea have been etched in historical precedence for over 200 years. Throughout the years, United States Naval Forward Presence has proven its importance in support of U.S. political objectives in the region for at least six reasons:

- It deters potential troublemakers.

- It reassures our allies that we are committed to the region.

- It prevents our allies from overreacting to situations.

- It gives diplomatic solutions a time to work, unlike an "all or nothing" weapon like air power, while providing a constant presence.

- United States naval vessels are sovereign U.S. territory and therefore are not subject to the same political constraints as land-based forces.

- Utilizing naval forward presence and prepositioning ships near the likely theater of operation significantly reduces reaction time and transportation expenses should conflict occur.

Thomas Jefferson laid the foundation for United States Naval Forward Presence in 1801, when he dispatched Commodore Edward Preble to the Mediterranean to get leaders of the Barbary States to abide by the Treaty of Peace signed in 1787. Subsequent intervention against the Barbary Pirates in support of the principle of "Freedom of the Seas" demonstrated the continuing importance of the region to the United States. United States Naval Forward Presence in the Mediterranean was subsequently reduced, because Britain's Royal Navy guaranteed U.S. interests there for the most part. However, in World War II the United States Navy once again returned in force to the Mediterranean to contribute to victory in a theater where success was important to the eventual defeat of the European Axis. Cutting the Axis supply lines and forcing Hitler to split his forces between the Mediterranean and the Eastern Front enabled Allied forces to attrite Axis forces while honing their own capabilities, all of which prepared the way for the successful invasions of the Continent in 1943 at Salerno and Normandy in 1944.

Supplied with adequate equipment and seasoned soldiers, the Allies finally defeated the Nazis in Europe and saved the world from fascism.

Following World War II, the Truman Doctrine signaled the United States' acceptance of responsibility for defending Europe's southern flank after Great Britain was no longer able to meet its commitments there. Formation of the Mediterranean Sixth Fleet allowed naval forward presence to remain in the region and influence many crisis situations throughout the years. The numerous Arab/Israeli wars and Middle East conflicts drew increased attention from American and Soviet naval power stationed in the Mediterranean. Constant posturing tested the nerves of both sides and ensured that neither side would take unilateral action in the conflicts. Nevertheless, heightened tensions led President Nixon to put all nuclear forces at DEFCON III after Leonid Brezhnev threatened to use unilateral force against Israel during the Yom Kippur War of 1973. Without United States naval forces present in the region, it is very likely that Israel would not have enjoyed the same success that it did during the war. United States naval forces provided the optimal means to strike at Muamaar Qadhafi's terrorist training camps in 1986. United States naval forward presence again proved its benefits during the Bosnian and Kosovo air campaigns. Even though the United States Navy did not have as many aircraft as the United States Air Force, it still managed to fly a significant portion of the actual strike missions. United States surface naval forces demonstrated their flexibility and proved their worth numerous times during both operations with short notice TLAM strikes.

However, there are drawbacks to positioning naval forces in littoral areas. Operating within confined waters and close to hostile territory puts American ships at

increased risk of attack from anti-ship cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, mine warfare and terrorist attacks like the one against the *USS Cole* in Aden, Yemen. Additionally, the possibility that a United States ship could be accidentally attacked, like the American communication ship *Liberty* during the 1967 Six Day War, is another risk of operating close to hostilities. The decreasing costs and increased availability of sea skimming cruise missiles and advanced sea-based mines increase the danger to American ships in littoral seas. However, the overall message is clear that naval forward presence has been an extremely important tool in the successful defense of the Mediterranean littoral. Although the CVBG may become more vulnerable to future weapons, it is still a viable and powerful composition of weapons platforms that will continue successfully to serve an important naval forward presence role in the Mediterranean Sea.

The political and economic importance of the Mediterranean Region to the United States will no doubt increase as the global marketplace expands throughout the world. Maintaining stability in the region means that the United States must use its naval forward presence to remain engaged with NATO allies and economic partners so that they do not overreact to situations and to ensure they know that America is interested in their political and economic well being. Additionally, deterring troublemakers from aggression requires American naval vessels to be positioned close enough to react quickly and keep situations from becoming crises. United States Naval Forward Presence has been in the Mediterranean Sea for over 200 years in support of political and economic policies decided on by America's leaders and will continue to provide sufficient military muscle to backup future American interests.

Overcoming geographical difficulties and suppressing the capabilities of countries employing anti-access techniques requires the United States Navy to forge ahead with new and improved weapons systems. American naval forces forward deployed to the Mediterranean or units transiting enroute to the Persian Gulf must continue to have technologically superior weapons that can guarantee their safety. Utilizing technological advances and innovative thinking can discourage rogue nations from believing that they have the upper hand and that their aggressive actions will not be met with an appropriate response by technologically superior forces. These advances are essential to enable Naval forces to operate safely in the littoral environment, in support of Small-Scale Contingencies or conventional operations against a more capable enemy. United States Naval Forward Presence has been and should remain in the Mediterranean Sea to protect vital sea-lanes of communication and to ensure that unfettered access is enjoyed by all nations whose ships transit this geographically significant "Middle Sea."

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACRONYMS

AAAV	Advanced Amphibious Assault Vehicle
ABCCC	Airborne Battlefield Command and Control Center
ASW	Anti Submarine Warfare
CEC	Cooperative Engagement Capability
CIWS	Close In Weapons System
EU	European Union
HARM	High-Speed Anti-Radiation Missile
LCAC	Landing Craft, Air Cushioned
MCM	Mine Countermeasures
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MEU(SOC)	Marine Expeditionary Unit Special Operations Capable
MIO	Maritime Interdiction Operation
NATO	North Atlantic treaty Organization
NEO	Non-Combat Evacuation Operation
NSSN	New Attack Submarine
OTHT	Over the Horizon Targeting
PKK	Kurdish Workers Party
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organization
RF	Radio Frequency
SEAD	Suppression of Enemy Air Defenses
SEAL	Sea, Air and Land
SLOC	Sea-Lanes of Communication
SNFM	Standing Naval Forces Mediterranean
SSC	Small-Scale Contingencies
TBMD	Theater Ballistic Missile Defense
TRAP	Tactical Recovery of Aircraft and/or Personnel
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UUV	Unmanned Underwater Vehicle
UN	United Nations

USS   United States Ship

VLS   Vertical Launch System

WEU   Western European Union

WMD   Weapon of Mass Destruction

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Airwise News, "Scud Missile Parts for Libya Uncovered at Gatwick." [http://news.airwise.com/stories/2000/01/947421591.html]. 21 May 2000.

"Allied Forces Southern Europe, Fact Sheet: Operation Sharp Guard." [http://fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/docs/SharpGuardFactSheet.html]. 26 April 2001.

Anti-Defamation League, "Update of Pan Am Lockerbie Bombing." [http://www.adl.org/terror/focus/17_focus_b_lockerbie.html]. Summer 1999.

Attard, D. and Fenech, D., "The Law of the Sea and Jurisdictional Issues in the Mediterranean," in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000.

Barletta, Michael and Jorgensen, Erik, "Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East," Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies. [http://www.cns.miis.edu/research/wmdme/use.htm]. May 1999.

Blanche, Ed, "Water Binds Syrian-Iraqi Relations," *Janes Intelligence Review*, v. 13, no. 2, February 2000.

Braudel, Fernand, "The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II," vol. I, New York: Fontana/Collins, 1976.

Cable, James, *Gunboat Diplomacy, 1919-1991*, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994.

Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Land Attack," [http://surfacewarfare.navy.mil/n86/sufires.html]. Accessed 15 November 2000.

Chief of Naval Operations, Surface Warfare Division (N76), "Maritime Dominance," [http://surfacewarfare.navy.mil/n86/md.html]. Accessed 15 November 2000.

Chief of Naval Operations, Submarine Warfare Division (N87), "The New Attack Submarine," [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/cno/n87/nssn.html]. Accessed 25 March 2001.

Clarke, Walter and Herbst, Jeffrey, *Learning From Somalia: The lessons of Armed Humanitarian Intervention*, Westview Press, 1997.

Cordesman, Anthony H., "The Lessons and Non-Lessons of the Air and Missile War in Kosovo: Executive Summary." [http://www.csis.org/kosovo/LessonsExec.pdf]. 20 July 1999.

"Countries Deploying only ASCMs." [http://www.cdiss.org/tabtechs.htm]. Accessed 8 May 2001.

Danner, Mark, "Bosnia: The Turning Point," *The New York Review*, 5 February 1998.

Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.

LCDR DeGeus, Stan, USN, *Joint Military Operations Reference Guide: Forces/Capabilities Handbook*, NWC 3153D, The United States Naval War College, January 1999.

Dismukes, Bradford, "*The Political-Strategic Case for Presence? Implications for Force Structure and Force Employment*," (Center for Naval Analyses, June 1993), CAB 93-7.

Dunn, Michael Collins, "The Old Assumptions Crumble," Volume 42, Number 1, Sea Power: Almanac Issue, 2001.

Fox News, "Egypt, Jordan Back Peace Efforts." [http://foxnews.com/story/0,2933,25206,00.html]. 20 May 2001.

Fulghum, David A., "U.S. Navy Reconnaissance Crucial in Albania, Bosnia," *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, [http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?TS=974483372&RQT=309&CC=1&Did=0000000 113651] Accessed 17 November 2000.

Gaffney, Henry H. Jr., *The U.S. Naval Contribution to Deterrence: What Has Not Happened in the World, and How the Presence of Naval Forces Contributed to Those Events Not Happening,* (Center for Naval Analyses, August 1995), CRM 95-139.

Goure, Dan, Mauldin, Dewey, and Kruel, John, "Naval Forward Presence: Present Status, Future Prospects," The Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C., 1997.

Gourley, Scott, "Setting the Seal on Maritime Special Operations Forces" *Jane's Navy International*, Vol. 104, 1 June 1999.

Hagan, Kenneth J., *In Peace and War: Interpretations of American Naval History, 1775-1984*, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, 1984.

Hajjar, Sami G., "The Stalled Peace Process: Israeli-Syrian Track," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999.

Henry, Ryan and Peartree, Edward, Center For Strategic Studies Report on Naval Forward Presence: Present Status, Future Prospects, *The Future of Naval Forward Presence*, November 1997.

Hessman, James, "Forward-Thinking and Forward Deployed," Sea Power, v. 40, November 1997.

Janssen Lok, Joris and Starr, Barbara, "Orion hunt a different prey" *Jane's Defense Weekly*, Vol. 22, 12 November 1994.

"Joint Statement on the Kosovo After Action Review." [http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Oct1999/b10141999_bt478-99.html]. 14 October 1999.

Judah, Tim, *Kosovo: War and Revenge,* Yale University Press, New haven, Connecticut 2000.

Judah, Tim, *The Serbs: History, Myth and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*, Yale

University Press, New Haven, Connecticut, 1997.

Keylor, William R., *The Twentieth Century World: An International History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1996.

Larrabee, F. Stephen, "Instability and Change in the Balkans*"*, *Survival*, Summer 1992.

Larrabee, Stephen and Thorson, Carla, Mediterranean Security: New Issues and Challenges, *RAND*, Santa Monica, CA, 1996.

Levine, Alan J., *The War Against Rommel's Supply Lines, 1942-1943*, Praeger Publishers, Westport, Connecticut, 1999.

Lewis, Jesse, Jr., The Strategic Balance in the Mediterranean, Foreign Affairs Study 29, *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*, Washington, D.C., 1976.

McIntyre, Jamie and Koppel, Andrea, "U.S. missiles pound targets in Afghanistan and Sudan." [http://www.cnn.com/US/9808/20/us.strikes.02.html]. 21 August 1998.

McNeill, J.R., "Ecology and Strategy in the Mediterranean: Points of Intersection*,"* in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000.

"Mediterranean Sea." http://www.encarta.msn.com/find/Concise.asp?z=1&pg=2&ti=01989000]. 6 March 2001.

Miskel, James F., US Post-war Naval Strategy in the Mediterranean Region, in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000.

Morocco, John D. and Wall, Robert, "NATO Vows Air Strikes Will Go The Distance," *Aviation Week and Space Technology*, (29 March 1999), available from LEXUS-NEXUS. Accessed 20 October 2000.

Moss, Kenneth B., "Strategic Choices in the Mediterranean: Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East," *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, [http://www.cc.columbia.edu/sec/dlc/ciao/olj/meria/meria00_mok01.html]. March 2000.

Vice Admiral Murphy, Daniel J., "The Navy in the Balkans," *Air Force Magazine*, December 1999.

Naval Doctrine Command, *Naval Doctrine Publication 1: Naval Warfare*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1994

"Navy announces results of its investigation on *USS Cole* (DDG 67)." [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/news/news_stories/cole.html]. 19 January 2001.

New York Times, "A Trail of Misery as Macedonia Fights Albanian Insurgency." [http://ebird.dtic.mil/may2001/e20010518trail.htm]. 18 May 2001.

"Oil Maritime Traffic." [http://wwwrempec.org/oil_traffic.html]. 21 April 2001

Parker, R.A.C., *The Second World War: A Short History,* Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.

Peterson, Gordon, "Cohen, Shelton Praise Kosovo Air Campaign; DDO to Review Results of Operation Allied Force." [http://www.navyleague.org/seapower/cohen_shelton_praise_kosovo_air_campaign.htm]. 5 May 2000.

Pike, John, "Mines." [http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/sys/ship/weaps/mines/htm]. 12 December 1998.

Pike, John, "Operation El Dorado Canyon." [http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/el_dorado_canyon.htm]. 27 June 1998.

Playfair, I.S.O., "The Mediterranean and the Middle East," vol IV, *The Destruction of the Axis Forces in Africa*, London: HMSO, 1966.

Porch, Douglas, *The Conquest Of Morocco*, Alfred A. Knopf Inc., New York, 1983.

"Progress in Kosovo Since the Conflict." [http://www.nato.int/kosovo/repo2000/progress.htm.] 30 October 2000.

Ragionieri, Rodolfo, "Europe, The Mediterranean and the Middle East," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999.

Said, Mohamed Kadry, "Missile Proliferation in the Middle East: A Regional Perspective." [http://www.onog.ch/unidir/1-02-eKadry.pdf]. Accessed 9 May 2001.

Schwalbe, David, "The Tripolitan War." [http://americanhistory.about.com/homework/americanhistory/library/weekly/bltripol.htm.] 3 June 1998

Sezer, Duygu Bazoglu, "Turkish Security Challenges in the 1990's," in Stephen J. Blank, ed. *Mediterranean Security: Into the Coming Millennium*, Strategic Studies Institute, 1999.

Shafir, Dov, The Strategic Significance of the Mediterranean Sea, *Center For Strategic Studies, Paper number 15, Jerusalem Post Press, 1982*.

Commander Sharer, Wayne D., "Command and Control: The Navy Way Over Kosovo," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, October 1999.

Siegel, Adam, Noer, John and Geis, Mark, "The MEU (SOC)s and the Kosovo Campaign: A precedent for the future?" *Center for Naval Analyses*, October 1999, CRM 99-131.

Simpson, Michael, "Superhighway to the Worldwide Web: The Mediterranean in British Imperial Strategy*," 1900-45,* in John B. Hattendorf, ed. *Naval Strategy and Policy in the Mediterranean: Past, Present and Future*, Frank Cass, London, 2000.

Major Sinnott, Anthony D., USMCR, "A Good Reputation is the Best Force Protection," *Marine Corps Gazette*, June 2000.

Commander Skinner, Joseph E., "Swarm the Littorals," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, March 2001.

Smith, Daniel and Valasek, Tomas, "U.S Forces in the Kosovo Theatre," *Center for Defense Information*, [http://www.cdi.org/issues/Europe/kosvforc3.html]. 9 April 1999.

Swider, Gregory M., Hayes, Monica, Brown, Janice P., *Naval Contributions to Bosnian Operations* (Center for Naval Analyses, October 1995), CRM 95-101.

Captain Tangredi, Sam J., USN, "The Fall and Rise of Naval Forward Presence." [http://usni.usni.org/Proceedings/Articles00/protangredi.htm]. May 2000.

"The Proliferation Challenge: Regional Capabilities, Intentions, and Trends." [http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/prolif/me_na.html]. Accessed 26 November 2000.

The United States Navy Fact File, "Attack Submarines – SSN," [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/factfile/ships/ship-ssn.html]. 7 November 2000.

The United States Navy Fact File, "Destroyers - DD, DDG" [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/factfile/ships/ship-dd.html]. 30 October 2000.

"To Bomb Sudan Plant, or Not: A Year Later, Debates Rankle," [http://www.nytimes.com/library/world/Africa/102799us-sudan.html]. 27 October 1999.

"20 killed as U.S. plane hits cable car wire in Italy." [http://cgi.cnn.com/WORLD/9802/03/italy.cablecar.update2]. 3 February 1998.

United States Energy Information Administration, "Caspian--Bosporus/Black Sea Issues," [http://www.eia.doe.gov/cabs/caspblk.html]. 10 May 2001.

United States Navy, "1997 Posture Statement," [http://www.chinfo.navy.mil/navpalib/policy/fromsea/pos97/pos-pg03.html]. 20 October 2000.

USA Today, "Milosevic has harsh words for new regime." [http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/nwssat03.htm]. 25 November 2000.

Wilson, George C., "Navy Missile Downs Jetliner on 4th of July." [http://www.geocities.com/CaptiolHill/5260/july88crash.html]. 4 July 1988.

Yost, David S., "NATO's New Roles: Implications for the U.S. Navy," 31 August 2000.

Yost, David S., *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security,* United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington D.C., 1998.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center...2
   8725 John J. Kingman Road, Suite 0944
   Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6218

2. Dudley Knox Library...2
   Naval Postgraduate School
   411 Dyer Road
   Monterey, CA 93943-5101

3. Professor James J. Wirtz..1
   Chairman, National Security Affairs (Code NS/WZ)
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, CA 93943

4. Professor Douglas Porch..1
   (Code NS/PD)
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, CA, 93943

5. Commander David Spain...1
   (Code NS/DS)
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, CA 93943

6. Professor David Yost...1
   (Code NS/DY)
   Naval Postgraduate School
   Monterey, CA 93943

7. Lieutenant Commander Timothy E. Kalley...5
   2989 West Canyon Ave.
   San Diego, CA 92123