

CORRESPONDENCE

LONG-TERM PLANNING OF MARINE ENGINEERING FOR THE FUTURE FLEET

SIR,

The introduction of new technologies into military fields is usually driven by successful development in the commercial sector in peacetime or the necessity for a rapid solution to a threat in time of war. However, if the advantages offered to marine applications by some promising new technologies are to be realized, there would seem to be a case for more activity than at present in the planning for the future fleet beyond ten years. Although this activity has tended to originate from Defence Scientific and Research staff there is surely a case for increasing such effort on the Naval Staff side, particularly from the operational viewpoint, or are the development staff raising and pursuing the technical feasibility of new technologies too early?

The Navy Department has, in peacetime, shown particular initiative in researching and studying new engineering ideas but has usually only fully developed those that have already shown success in commercial applications. However, there is increasing evidence that the UK is falling behind in developing new ideas and that some future systems may need to be licensed from overseas.

The marine engineering department now has a comparatively small development objectives programme for the future fleet, which is separate from the programmes to support the running fleet and from ship projects covered by staff requirements. The main aim is to develop new equipments to the point where they can be specified with confidence during the formulation of a Staff Requirement. Its purpose is to pursue innovation—modern and new technologies in areas where an operational advantage is likely to arise or cost advantages are worthwhile. Some minor work in this programme is aimed at assessing new concepts and establishing whether they merit consideration for further development.

However, support for innovative and non-evolutionary ideas, which are likely to have a development time of more than ten years, is generally lacking beyond the relatively inexpensive study stages, even when these show great promise. Factors which affect this lack of support are:

- (a) The lack of a Staff Requirement.
- (b) Timescales; although a study might show great promise, it is usually too late for development in the normal timescale for warship projects that might be under consideration at the time and is shelved—until the next time?—when the study is sometimes repeated to allow for any changes that might have occurred. This often results in a promising new technology not being developed at all.
- (c) That ‘Defence policy does not change much, in the round, and therefore it is hardly surprising that the strategy for its implementation should be generally evolutionary’ and that ‘The natural expression of defence policy is the defence programme, which maps out, over the next ten years in some detail and further in principle, the financial resources which are planned to be expended on the various components of defence capability.’¹, p. 141

In the present climate of control of expenditure and in view of the above points it would seem that the possibility of the introduction of new technologies to marine applications will become even more remote than in the past. Finally, I repeat the questions raised earlier: Is there a case for

increasing, from the operational viewpoint, the planning effort for the future fleet beyond ten years or are the development staff raising and pursuing the feasibility of new technologies too early?

(Sgd.) V. W. Adams
Sea Systems Controllerate

Reference

1. Walmsley, R.: MOD engineering; *Journal of Naval Engineering*, vol. 32, no. 1, Dec. 1989, pp. 140-144.

WHERE THE HELL'S MY RELIEF?

SIR,

It is very encouraging to see that the debate on recruiting is being sustained within your columns. The letter from Mid (now S/Lt) J. S. Luke concerning Presentation Teams, and their effectiveness, deserves a reply and I would be grateful for the opportunity to do so in the *Journal*. In formulating this reply I have listened to the views both of the Captain Royal Naval Presentation Team and of my own Engineer Officer Presentation Team.

Without wishing to sound complacent, I am confident that the wide range of Presentation Teams that the Service now deploys have adopted a more personal and relaxed style in recent years, and current feedback from audiences reinforces this view. However I entirely agree with the need for a much more adaptable approach that can respond more readily to the varying needs of the different audiences. It is with this in mind that DNR is about to review the style and content of the various presentations for which he is responsible.

There is no doubt in my mind that the 'customer' needs to be able to see the human side of the Royal Navy, while the Service must be able to recognize the differing needs of individuals/schools.

If I may finally respond to some of the perceptions of Mid Luke's peers:

- (a) The RNPT has never been billed as a recruiting campaign. Disclaimers are regularly made, in bidding letters, during the course of the presentation, and during question time.
- (b) It is a shame that the doubts voiced about the effectiveness of the Seawolf System were not properly aired and debated at the time. The RNPT takes great pride in the accuracy of its information and ability to discuss topics based on the very latest available information.
- (c) The very 'professionalism' displayed by the RNPT is seen by many as one of its prime assets, and is frequently pointed up by schools as an example of how to do things properly. We would depart from such high standards at our peril.
- (d) The perceived lack of challenge or reward in a naval career is something the DNR is continually trying to alter. We need the likes of the author to return to his school to convince his former school friends of their misguided views!

Rest assured that DNR is very alive to 'one of the greatest challenges in the future'.

(Sgd.) A. P. Masterton-Smith
Captain, Royal Navy
Deputy Director of Naval Recruiting

COMMENTS ON THE LAST ISSUE

SIR,

The December issue was truly a bumper issue with many fascinating articles. In particular, 'HMS 2010' was a most interesting glimpse at a very probable future but I do wish that the author had not introduced an unnecessary and potentially dangerous centre line bulkhead. Japanese cruisers of World War II had this feature which helped 9 of the 10 hit in the machinery spaces to capsize. The small wing compartments abreast the after boiler room of British cruisers of the same vintage contributed to 6 capsizes. Longitudinal subdivision has no place in anything smaller than a battleship.

I recently had the chance to study the IME program, mentioned by Mr Baker, and found its ability to trace, in both directions, from a requirement or multiple requirements to hardware, to be a most valuable feature. I believe that this could be used to develop functional costing which, for the first time, could answer such questions as the true cost of shock protection. It might help to explain why the addition of such an attribute costs much more than the saving offered if it is omitted from a design already so fitted.

Finally, I was delighted to see the use of the title 'Eur Ing' and hope that British engineers will use it more widely and, perhaps, so enhance the status of engineering.

(Sgd.) David K. Brown, RCNC
(Consultant Naval Architect)
Woodborough Farm House, Woodborough,
Peasedown St. John,
Bath BA2 8LN

Eur Ing, RN

'Eur Ing' (the abbreviation of European Engineer) designates a Chartered or other professional Engineer registered with the Fédération Européenne des Associations Nationales d'Ingénieurs. This organization was formed to secure the recognition and status of European engineering qualifications in order to facilitate the employment of professional engineers internationally. The Engineering Council recommends that the title Eur Ing be used before any other title or rank.*

SIR,

I had always understood that 'Eur Ing' was a title which preceded the name of the holder. Yet the *Journal*, usually so correct, puts it as a qualification after Rear-Admiral Bawtree's name in the Personal News item in the last issue.

What is RN practice, please?

(Sgd.) C. Dog

*Since these letters were written, a Tri-Service decision has been made that 'Eur Ing' shall appear *after* the names of Service personnel so qualified.

SIR,

C. Dog is of course quite correct. The Engineering Council did require the Eur Ing qualification to be used as a prefix rather than a suffix. I happen to think that this is wrong. Within the discussions was the concern that the status of Engineers should be nationally recognized, and envious nods were made towards Continental practice. I argued that Eur Ing does not have that 'Colgate ring' about it, and until some better title is thought up we should continue to use professional qualifications as suffices. On the naval side I feel that I am a member of the Officer Corps first, but an Engineering specialist within it. If the other specializations decide to use prefixes, such as Barrister Lieutenant-Commander C. Dog, then I will be happy to conform. Until then I intend to continue to use Eur Ing as a suffix.

(Sgd.) D. K. Bawtree
Rear-Admiral
Flag Officer Portsmouth

JSP 101 v. THE OXFORD DICTIONARY

SIR,

In 1984 Change 5 to *The Joint Services Staff Manual, JSP 101*, included a small but important alteration to the forms in which naval ranks should be written. Since then, as the Engineer Officer who generated the change, I have waited patiently for *JNE* to catch up. This has not happened, and I can wait no longer.

There are only two acceptable formats for naval ranks; they should be written in full without hyphens, or the approved abbreviations in *JSP 101* should be used. The random mix of abbreviations, particularly for Lieutenant Commander, used in *JNE* is exceedingly annoying and apparently serves no purpose. The inclusion of hyphens must now be considered as archaic.

Our colleagues in the other specializations have been known to browse through a copy of *JNE*, and it does us no great service for them to see an otherwise prestigious publication falling down on a small point of detail such as this.

(Sgd.) Scott Hulland
Commander Royal Navy

SIR!

All standard conventions of spelling and abbreviation are equally right but a publication can use only one of them. Among publishers this is known as the 'house style'. The *Journal of Naval Engineering* follows *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*; thus -ize, rather than -ise, and hyphenated ranks.

Neither the language nor *Journal* practice is fixed permanently, and I am grateful to Commander Hulland for his suggestion. He clearly has a *prima facie* case for change. What could seem more appropriate than for a naval journal to follow the rules laid down in a Joint Service Publication?

The *Oxford English Dictionary*, with its supplements (the last of which appeared only five years ago) and its concise version, is *descriptive* of what current written English is, not *prescriptive* of what it should be. *JSP 101*, on the other hand, 'contains instructions agreed between the 3 Armed Services for the preparation and presentation of staff paperwork' (foreword, para. 1). Most readers are not on military staffs and many are naval civilians or in industry.

For its breadth of readership and consistency with other scientific and engineering publications in UK, the *Journal* uses English English, not US English, nor a special naval English. *JSP 101* itself defines jargon as a 'mode of speech familiar only to a group or profession' (para. 107.a.(9)). The *Journal* endeavours to avoid both technical jargon (so far as possible) and naval jargon.

(Sgd.) Trevor Shaw
Commander, Royal Navy (ret.)
Editor, *Journal of Naval Engineering*

(Commander Hulland has pointed out, since these letters were set in type, that 'before the Staff Colleges generated this change to *JSP 101* we consulted with the editors of the *Oxford Dictionary*. They were in agreement, and we can expect to see future editions reflect this change.' When the *OED* moves, we shall all move.)