

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**THE ROLE OF THE U.S. NAVY IN SUPPORT
OF THE NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR MARITIME SECURITY**

by

Commander Peter J. Winter
United States Navy

Captain Albert F. Lord, Jr.
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, 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. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE 15 MAR 2006	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2005 to 00-00-2006			
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Role of the U.S. Navy in Support of the National Strategy for Maritime Security		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER			
		5b. GRANT NUMBER			
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER			
6. AUTHOR(S) Peter Winter		5d. PROJECT NUMBER			
		5e. TASK NUMBER			
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER			
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)			
		11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)			
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 22	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Commander Peter J. Winter
TITLE: The Role of the U.S. Navy In Support of the National Strategy for Maritime Security
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 15 March 2006 WORD COUNT: 6333 PAGES: 21
KEY TERMS: Homeland Security, Maritime Operations, Sea Power
CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The National Strategy for Maritime Security is a relatively recent plan for employing America's finite assets and capabilities to secure the maritime domain from vulnerability to terrorist attacks and to enhance the nation's overall protection. In an effort to bring the maritime capabilities of the United States Navy to bear, systematic utilization of naval forces in support of maritime security is an area which requires additional integration. The intent of this paper is to examine the Strategy for Maritime Security, analyze the current means available, use current Chief of Naval Operations guidance and policies in relation to the mission, and determine a path for the future employment of naval forces. Short term, as well as long term, solutions will be discussed and the implications for the Navy will be determined. Specifically, manpower requirements, force structure, training requirements, and the impact to current vision, missions, principles, tasks, and objectives will be analyzed.

THE ROLE OF THE U.S. NAVY IN SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR MARITIME SECURITY

A strong world economy enhances our national security by advancing prosperity and freedom in the rest of the world. Economic growth supported by free trade and free markets creates new jobs and higher incomes. It allows people to lift their lives out of poverty, spurs economic and legal reform, and the fight against corruption, and it reinforces the habits of liberty. We will promote economic growth and economic freedom beyond America's shores.¹

- George W. Bush

The *National Strategy for Homeland Security (NSHS)* was written as a result of National Security Presidential Directive NSPD-41/Homeland Security Presidential Directive HSPS-13. It defined three strategic objectives in order to protect the nation from terrorism: prevent terrorist attacks within the United States; reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism; and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur.² The Department of Homeland Security and the Office of the Secretary of Defense have responsibility for protecting the nation and its interests, and the *National Strategy for Maritime Security (NSMS)* was written as a policy document to define the ends, ways, and means to accomplish the task in the maritime domain. Directed by the President in December 2004 and recently published in September 2005, the strategy was the result of a collaborative effort between the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security. The goal of the new strategy is to better synchronize the various national efforts and ensure effective and efficient implementation. In order to accomplish the objectives of the strategy, eight supporting documents are currently published or under development to align the efforts of federal, state, local, and private sector entities that integrate maritime security programs and initiatives. Will our national effort to protect the global maritime commons, and the economic prosperity that ensues as a result of free use of the maritime domain,³ be sufficient to "protect legitimate activities while preventing hostile or illegal acts"⁴ around the globe?

It is clear that the United States has thrived on being a nation rich in maritime heritage and power with a strong Navy to support its policies. Control of the sea has led to great economic prosperity and has been a key enabler of national security. Therefore, continued interest in maritime security is of utmost importance in the age of globalization and is critical to help facilitate the efforts in the War on Terrorism. In today's global market economy, the oceans are becoming increasingly important as more nations take advantage of the maritime environment. With more than eighty percent of the world's trade traveling by water,⁵ security for commercial shipping has reaffirmed its strategic importance for all countries. Yet threats to the shipping industry continue to increase around the world as terrorist networks have become increasingly

savvy in exploiting the critical trading hubs and strategic chokepoints through which seventy-five percent of the world's maritime trade and half its daily oil consumption⁶ pass. Defeating the wide array of threats to maritime security needs to become a top priority with a significant role for the United States Navy if our nation wishes to maintain its economic freedom and prosperity.

Scope and Methodology

The security of the maritime domain is not solely an effort to be conducted by the United States. Comprehensive and cohesive efforts are required by all nations that possess a common interest in global maritime security. *The National Strategy for Maritime Security* describes how the government will promote a comprehensive and cohesive national effort, alongside a strong international effort, to enhance the security and freedom of the domain for legitimate purposes.

Three broad, overarching principles are extracted from other national strategic documents that provide guidance to the *NSMS*. First, freedom of the seas is a top priority and an essential global freedom that helps promote the world's economy. Second, the government must defend shipping since its economy is inextricably linked to the ocean. Third, the government needs to institute a layered maritime security system that will be used to allow desirable goods to enter while screening out dangerous people and material. In accordance with these three principles and domestic and international law, the *NSMS* has outlined the United States' maritime security objectives as follows: (1) Prevent Terrorist Attacks and Criminal or Hostile Acts; (2) Protect Maritime-Related Population Centers and Critical Infrastructures; (3) Minimize Damage and Expedite Recovery; and (4) Safeguard the Ocean and Its Resources.⁷

The *NSMS* has laid out a comprehensive plan to promote global economic stability, protect legitimate maritime activities, and prevent illegal actions in the maritime domain that relies on the efforts of public, private, and international maritime security efforts. Successful defense of the maritime domain also requires a concerted effort on the part of intelligence organizations to openly and rapidly disseminate information needed to protect the maritime domain. As a result of these prerequisites for success, five strategic actions (ways) have been cited to help achieve the strategic objectives of *NSMS*: (1) Enhance International Cooperation; (2) Maximize Domain Awareness; (3) Embed Security into Commercial Practices; (4) Deploy Layered Security; and (5) Assure Continuity of the Maritime Transportation System.⁸ These five strategic actions are not implemented in a vacuum. They are all inter-related, with domain awareness as the key enabler for all the actions. Only through effective integration of these actions will the United States be able to ensure a safe maritime environment.

Once the objectives and strategic actions are identified, the *NSMS* directs the coordination of government maritime security programs and initiatives to achieve a cohesive national effort at the federal, state, local, and private sector levels. This involves the development of eight separate supporting implementation plans to enhance the overall strategy. Some of these documents have been released by the Department of Homeland Security and are available for immediate implementation and review, while others are still under development and will be available shortly. Four of these supporting implementation plans allow the integration of efforts from the Department of Defense, particularly the sea-going services, which will contribute significantly to enhancing security of maritime domain. Specifically, the *National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness*, the *Global Maritime Intelligence Integration Plan*, the *International Outreach and Coordination Strategy*, and the *Maritime Transportation System Security Plan* all contain a framework in which the Department of Defense can take an active role. It is through adherence to these supporting documents and the use of all elements of national power that the nation will provide the means to reduce risk and achieve success in supporting security of the homeland against terrorist actions via the maritime domain.

Successful defense of the maritime domain will not come simply as a result of the actions of the United States. Instead, defense of the maritime domain results from effective coalition efforts over an extended period of time since the maritime domain does not fall under the jurisdiction of any single nation's sovereignty or jurisdiction. The United Nations Convention on The Law of the Sea gives guidance and sets customary practices for use of the sea, but all maritime nations have not adopted the document and some nations have varying degrees of compliance with the provisions. Increased economic interdependence and globalization are made possible by the uninterrupted use of maritime shipping, which also emphasizes the need for a coordinated international effort.

Analysis

A feasibility assessment of the *NSMS* should be conducted in order to come to a conclusion on its overall effectiveness. Does the government have the means to execute the strategy? Do the supporting implementation plans and the elements of national power provide sufficient resources to meet today's challenging global environment? As previously stated, the National Maritime Security Strategy involves enhancing international cooperation to ensure lawful and timely enforcement actions are conducted against maritime threats. But just because the United States supports close cooperation among nations and international organizations that require security of the maritime domain, does it mean that the nation will be able to

convince other nations that these initiatives are both affordable and in their best interest? Implementing standardized security practices and procedures, developing networks for rapid information exchange, and implementing effective interdiction measures are all good methods of achieving maritime security. The United States should choose a strategy of selective engagement with strategic partners and share the funding for these initiatives. The nation has useful and readily available tools to achieve this strategic end and needs to utilize additional elements of national power, such as economic and informational, to attain the enhanced international cooperation that is required for success.

The need to maximize maritime domain awareness to identify potential threats at an optimal distance and interdict with capable forces is critical. But achieving this awareness can be challenging. The sheer size of the maritime domain presents severe problems that even the most capable nations cannot easily overcome unless all available means are used. As a result of the need to protect our vital national interests, a Maritime Domain Awareness concept was developed. Success in this area will depend heavily on a global maritime intelligence capability, shared situational awareness, increased law enforcement capabilities, and an unprecedented amount of cooperation between the various elements of maritime security. This may initially sound like a daunting task, but a large portion of the assets required to make it work already exist or are currently under development. With a concerted effort to enhance the capabilities of current systems and develop new capabilities and procedures to locate and track maritime threats, the nation will be able to achieve strategic success.

Potential adversaries can and will exploit known weaknesses in the maritime domain. Specifically, attacks against a wide variety of platforms using explosive-laden craft and acts of piracy or maritime crime have impacted legitimate commercial maritime security. To reduce this vulnerability, enhanced security must be embedded into commercial practices. A close partnership between the government and the private sector is essential in the effort to reduce security vulnerabilities. It also requires a concerted effort by international partners to continue providing advance information about shipping containers prior to arrival in the United States. The National Targeting Center (NTC) was established as the centralized coordination point for all Customs and Border Protection's anti-terrorism efforts.⁹ The NTC is responsible for reviewing all shipping information prior to arrival in the United States, utilizing intelligence and criminal activity indicators to alert law enforcement agencies of suspect cargo or behavior. Lastly, cooperation with the private sector to optimize the use of existing databases and reducing the impact on maritime business operations will help share the burden of security efforts and defray costs to the government.

The ability to achieve maritime security is contingent upon a layered security system that integrates the capabilities of governments and commercial interests throughout the world.¹⁰ Layered security means that security measures will be applied at all points of vulnerability along the shipping continuum and can be applied randomly to deter terrorist activity. To intercept and defeat transnational terrorist threats, the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Defense, Department of Justice, and Department of State must mutually support each other and become more effective in the inter-agency process. This is questionable based on the ability of large bureaucracies to smoothly transition to an environment of complete and total cooperation with each other. However, numerous success stories exist where effective inter-agency cooperation has resulted in good working relationships concluding with positive interaction and results. For example, the Joint Interagency Task Forces (JIATF) South and West have been conducting counter-drug operations and intelligence fusion efforts since 1989 and have achieved a high degree of success coordinating the actions of numerous agencies. Based on the success of these organizations, it is logical to believe that new task forces can be constructed to protect the security of the maritime domain in accordance with the objectives of the *NSMS*.

In the aftermath of a terrorist attack or other disruptive incident within the maritime domain, the United States expects to assure continuity of the marine transportation system to maintain commerce. This is clearly defined in the *NSHS* and has been further delineated within the *National Response Plan*. This is feasible in the maritime domain surrounding the United States, but if an incident occurred at a strategic chokepoint location on the high seas or in a foreign port the results may be a little different. Global economic activity that uses the high seas is estimated to increase due to rapidly expanding population growth and the emergence of new economic powers. Therefore, international cooperation is vital to protect and reconstitute commerce and minimize the global impact in the event of a significant maritime incident. Additionally, properly integrating the capabilities and resources of the military element of national power will strengthen international organizations' ability to respond to maritime incidents. This can be achieved by developing and deploying the military's consequence management capability.

An assessment of the *NSMS* follows in order to determine if there is sufficient domestic and Congressional support to fully implement the strategic actions required for protecting the maritime domain. The overarching strategic objective is to protect the United States from terrorist activity and secure our economic well-being. The ways and means of implementing this strategy are laid out in some detail and provide a sound and supportable position. It would also

benefit international partners to accept these measures in order to achieve better maritime security, but limited resources place severe restraints on a developing nation's ability to fully implement all the measures called for in the *NSMS*. A reprioritization of which critical infrastructures to protect is in the best interest of the nation. For example, the airline industry benefited greatly from increased security measures following the events of September 11, 2001. The ensuing increase in governmental security regulations, oversight, and funding has arguably resulted in no additional terrorist actions against airliners. Although there may be only a circumstantial correlation between increased security initiatives and the lack of new attacks, the maritime industry and its associated infrastructure are potential candidates for terrorist activity. As the world's leading maritime trading nation, protecting the country's national interests, resources, and economic power should be incentive enough to ensure the United States is doing what it can reasonably afford to prevent future catastrophic incidents in the maritime domain and limit the potentially severe damage to the global economy.

The last issue to assess is if the ways and means are suitable to achieve the desired ends. The strategy certainly faces some daunting challenges. The maritime domain is a vast expanse in which no international body has jurisdiction. Potential adversaries are diverse, possess capabilities to exploit the environment, and have carried out terrorist attacks in the maritime domain. Additionally, the volume of legitimate commerce complicates the search for illegal activity, and financial resources and technological developments are only capable of properly scrutinizing those shipments that are suspect based on intelligence assessments. Because of these challenges, the effective implementation of the *NSMS* requires a thorough assessment of the threat, a sound analysis regarding where to spend limited financial capital, the commitment of law enforcement agencies, increased diplomatic and economic measures with international partners, and increased use of the military element of national power in order to achieve the necessary amount of maritime security. The nation will stand to benefit from these measures that support advancing economic well-being across the globe. An integrated approach between governmental and nongovernmental agencies, the public and private sectors, and international partners will be required to monitor and safeguard the maritime domain. Greater trust, confidence, and interoperability between governmental departments will be needed. International cooperation will become even more critical to prevent unlawful exploitation of the maritime domain. Can the United States achieve the desired end state with its current international and domestic posture? The results of the current strategy are certainly positive to date. So is the strategy suitable to achieve the desired ends? The ability to effectively utilize all the ways and means available to the nation is critical in order to successfully meet the

desired ends. But is the nation properly using all available sources of national power at this stage in the game? Or are we hoping that our current efforts will meet the desired ends without continuing to develop innovative and effective methods to achieve success? True change in the maritime security policy objectives was initiated by the events of September 11, 2001. A similar disaster in the maritime domain could inflict serious economic hardship on the world economy and have detrimental effects for years to come. Prevention of such a catastrophic event is the goal of the NSMS and the United States Navy can be an integral part of sufficiently protecting our interests.

Risk Assessment

A risk assessment is required to determine the second and third order effects that the complete or partial implementation of this strategy could have. What is the impact to the global economy if a catastrophic maritime disaster takes place? In order to perform risk assessment, a system should be used that identifies the probability of an event occurring and the consequences once the event has occurred. Once this is complete, controls need to be implemented to mitigate the potential risk. This is the intent of the strategic actions laid out in the NSMS. Some type of feedback mechanism should be used to continuously assess if the controls in place are effectively achieving the desired end state of maritime security and national economic prosperity. In order to help facilitate understanding the consequences of implementing a robust maritime security capability, the probability of maritime security incidents occurring and the severity of such incidents need to be analyzed against the controls in place.

The consequences associated with a maritime security failure are easy to determine based on our understanding of the maritime domain and the relationship to the global economy. In an article written by a member of the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, estimates of the cost of pirate attacks in the Malacca and Singapore Straits are around \$250 million a year. The global impact from a closure of the port of Singapore alone could exceed \$200 billion from disruptions to inventory and production cycles. Additionally, the disruption of port activity in the western United States back in 2002 due to industrial action cost the nation up to \$1 billion dollars per day.¹¹ Potential threat intentions are difficult to accurately predict; therefore, the continued efforts of intelligence, military, and law enforcement agencies are critical to understanding and assessing the threat in the international arena. The ambiguous security environment will require teamwork to prevent or respond to transnational threats, protect commerce, and expedite recovery of the marine infrastructure. The current risk associated with the nation's ability to provide ample maritime security in accordance with the NSMS can be

assessed as being high since the consequences associated with a catastrophic incident may have significant security and economic impacts. But this does not necessarily reflect reality when it comes to understanding the potential for future maritime security breaches. It is impossible to completely eliminate risk or to completely defend against all potential threats. As a result of the possibility of a disastrous event taking place and the severity of the impact on the national or global economy, the risk associated with protecting the security of the maritime domain can arguably be determined to be high. Although the supporting implementation plans cover the entire realm of possibilities at the strategic and conceptual level, some analysts have noted a discreet lack of detail in the plans and indicate that technological requirements and a protocol to administer the efforts will require additional analysis.¹² Due to the fact that the risk associated with this strategy is potentially high, additional measures should be taken to reduce the potential for disaster in the maritime domain. Lastly, continuous reassessment of the effectiveness of the strategic actions utilizing practical measures of effectiveness will help achieve a secure environment and continue to manage the inherent risk in today's world. Examples of measures of effectiveness may include quantitative assessments such as the cost of container screening initiatives versus number of containers screened, regional economic impact of a catastrophic event versus cost of security measures implemented, or qualitative assessments such as congressionally mandated spending on maritime security versus popular support of the measures.

Recommendations

This analysis of the *National Strategy for Maritime Security* would not be complete unless additional recommendations concerning ends, ways, and means were offered. Starting with the ends, the stated strategic objectives defined in the *NSMS* are consistent with those of higher supporting documents and display a high degree of support to national security interests. They are also in line with stated policy to take all necessary actions to enhance the security of the maritime domain. The only suggestions regarding strategic ends would be in the area of how broadly the objectives are stated, and avoiding the use of absolute terms such as "always" and "never" to define the objectives. Use of such language generally results in an ends/means mismatch and introduces unnecessary amounts of risk. Careful selection of terms such as "acceptable" and "minimal" when defining risk should be used to focus finite economic and military means.

Regarding the stated ways of the *NSMS*, a high degree of cooperation is required from the private sector and international partners in order to successfully defend the maritime

domain. The decision of how to pay for maritime security initiatives has been debated in Congress, and, according to many members of Congress, is stalling efforts at improving security. The debate centers on whether security measures should be paid for with federal revenues, by state or local governments, by the maritime industry, or by a cost sharing agreement.¹³ Since maximum security is prohibitively expensive, apportioning funds according to relative vulnerability and economic importance must be taken into account. The United States has not fully implemented all of the security initiatives required for maritime security due to limited resources and competing priorities. In addition, the benefits of adopting new security initiatives by foreign nations may not be fully realized based on their inability to find resources for improving port security. Convincing foreign nations to implement more robust security measures that are in their best economic interest will likely require innovative methods of providing financial support for strengthening their maritime security infrastructure.¹⁴ The concepts of embedding security into commercial practices, utilizing layered security, safeguarding the open seas, and maximizing domain awareness are sound ideas that have proven to be effective actions at improving maritime security.

Finally, the means that we have to implement this strategy are finite. Through effective use of all elements of national power to support the implementation plans, in particular the United States Navy, the maritime domain can be made more secure to ensure economic prosperity on a national and global scale. The only issue is how to properly manage the resources we have, continuously reassessing the strategy, and making tough decisions about asset allocation and employment. Eventually, limited means and strategic actions may precipitate a situation where these limitations could begin to start dictating the strategic ends. This requires that the United States must continually reassess its dedication to protecting the maritime domain and allow the U.S. Navy to assume an increasingly active role in support of the pursuit of maritime security. In particular, increased integration of U. S. Navy capabilities has the potential to increase the effectiveness of the NSMS in the areas of intelligence fusion, international strategic cooperation, anti-piracy, protection of critical infrastructure, persistent surveillance, and counter-terrorism.

Future Naval Roles

The United States Navy is operating around the globe in support of national military strategic objectives. At any one time, naval assets can be found in all geographic combatant command areas conducting operations across the spectrum of its capabilities. Operations run the gamut from participation in the Global War on Terrorism, participation in disaster relief

efforts in times of crisis, conducting maritime security operations, supporting Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM, participation in theater security cooperation strategic initiatives, conducting maritime interception operations, to participation in numerous coalition operations. The Navy has been able to sustain an increased operational tempo and maintain a surge capability to answer the call when tasked. Increased awareness of the maritime domain and support of the *National Strategy for Maritime Security* are roles that the Navy is capable of assuming in the future. If the United States is committed to securing the nation's economy against threats to maritime security and looking for innovative strategic means to accomplish the strategic objectives of the *NSMS*, then increased participation by the United States Navy is one way to accomplish the goal. The following potential future roles describe numerous ways that the Navy can become an even more active participant.

First, the Navy's role in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization needs to be expanded to include increased active participation in all current measures that support maritime security. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has stated that "the U.S. would mount a maritime interdiction effort anywhere the benefits outweighed the costs."¹⁵ Since NATO already has an active role in combating maritime terrorism through Standing NATO Response Force Maritime Group TWO, and the U.S. Navy has stated that it could extend the anti-terrorism campaign to counter piracy, gunrunning, drug, and human trafficking,¹⁶ it seems logical that U.S. participation in operations such as ACTIVE ENDEAVOR¹⁷ should be undertaken on an increased scale. As a permanent member nation, the United States can increase training to other member nations and assume a greater role in patrolling the seas. Several chokepoints, including the Strait of Gibraltar and the Bosphorus Strait, have been used by terrorists in the past and provide numerous future opportunities to disrupt legitimate shipping in these areas. The vast intelligence capability of the Navy can assist NATO in efforts to monitor and protect the world's main shipping lanes.

Second, since the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Michael G. Mullen is actively seeking a fleet that will give the Navy a greater role in counterterrorism efforts, his recommendation to build a "brown-water" capability and a fleet of littoral combat ships is seen as a step in the right direction. But the decision to currently field only fifty-five of these vessels¹⁸ may leave the Navy with less than the desired number of ships to carry out future missions. More of these highly capable and rapidly reconfigurable ships could have a significant effect on the number of missions that the Navy could undertake to combat terrorism and maintain maritime security. Number of ships equates to number of potential engagement operations and, since requirements for naval participation continue to rise, the Navy could spread its influence to

more global hotspots that require engagement. An increased number of littoral combat ships have a price tag, but this could be paid for through a reduction in the number of other platforms such as DD(X), aircraft carriers, or CG(X).

Third, the protection of critical maritime infrastructures has been cited by Admiral Stavridis and Captain Pandolfe as "...a growing role for military forces in every theater."¹⁹ Global economic growth is critical to the welfare of many nations around the globe and secure sea lines deliver that capability. The United States Navy should do several things in the near future: increase the footprint of Naval Coastal Warfare commands (specifically Mobile Security Forces) and increase Naval Special Warfare integration into foreign internal defense roles. Naval support to security efforts designed to protect critical infrastructure in strategic seaports in the United States and abroad should become increasingly important. Protecting offshore oil platforms in the Arabian Gulf has been one mission for Mobile Security Force detachments in the past and should continue to be a crucial mission in the future. The geographic areas in which we employ these teams must be expanded; hence the number of teams must be increased to fill this requirement. Oil production and distribution facilities are increasingly important in developing areas of the world as the need for these natural resources increases. The facilities owned by the United States are also susceptible to terrorist activity and Naval Forces should augment existing maritime security forces.

A fourth means by which Naval Forces can support maritime security efforts is also offered by Stavridis and Pandolfe as "...defense against terrorism requires continual vigilance."²⁰ Their call for the investment in unmanned surveillance assets (air, surface, undersea) to augment current intelligence gathering capabilities resident in manned platforms is right on target for the development of future naval capabilities to achieve maritime security. These systems, and the data that they collect, can be integrated into the network of sensors that the Navy utilizes to control the battle space. Although this technology is very expensive and requires human analysis of the information, the time to invest in these capabilities is now. Advances in undersea warfare systems can be a force multiplier and enable manned systems to be engaged in other operations in a safer environment. New technological developments in unmanned surface vehicle technology can also be exploited by commanders to detect, classify, and engage potential terrorist threats at a distance. Effective counterterrorist activities in support of global maritime security can be significantly enhanced by unmanned surveillance assets owned and operated by naval forces.

A fifth measure that the Navy can take is a more proactive role in the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI).²¹ As President Bush has stated, "We're prepared to search planes and ships, to

seize weapons and missiles and equipment that raise proliferation concerns...²² The use of naval power to interdict suspect shipments of illegal material has become a core competency in the last few decades, but usually under the guidance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Admiral Mullen, then Vice-Chief of Naval Operations, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on October 21, 2003, endorsed the UNCLOS by stating it supported the Navy's mission of "...sustaining our overseas presence, responding to complex emergencies, prosecuting the global war on terror,..."²³ Along with UNCLOS, the PSI would encourage naval cooperation between PSI members and strengthen the militaries of other member nations to provide increased maritime security around the globe. Since the Navy is limited in the amount of overseas presence it can provide, it only makes sense to operate and train with other navies to conduct the same type of security operations that we currently are involved in. This type of involvement through the Proliferation Security Initiative should be an objective for all Combatant Commanders, and subordinate Naval Forces, as the Global War on Terrorism continues to be prosecuted.

Sixth on the list of ways to increase the Navy's role in maritime security and the fight against international terrorism is by transforming the role that naval intelligence plays on a global scale. Rear Admiral (Ret.) Richard Porterfield, the former Director of Naval Intelligence, has stated that "We are reevaluating U.S. military roles and missions along with their intelligence support..." and "... my posture statement to the Chief of Naval Operations in March [2005] emphasized this and recommended an increased naval intelligence end-strength."²⁴ He also referred to expanding the collection and analysis against traditional threats towards a predictive intelligence capability that would include support to Special Warfare units, human intelligence, and global maritime domain awareness.²⁵ These areas of increased focus and capability are consistent with the means prescribed in the *National Strategy for Maritime Security* and are a step in the right direction to secure our maritime domain. In particular, the naval intelligence community's work with the Department of Homeland Security to help develop the Global Maritime Intelligence Integration Center supports other ongoing maritime security initiatives, including current maritime interdiction operations and the Proliferation Security Initiative. This increased capacity to conduct intelligence support comes with the realization that the current size of the intelligence community is inadequate. In order to meet the demanding requirements associated with increased maritime security, a potential significant increase to the manning end-strength needs to occur if efforts at automation and integration produce less than desirable results. Additionally, increased cooperation and synchronization with outside

intelligence organizations (both foreign and U.S.) not currently being exploited is another means to achieve increased capability.

A seventh recommendation focuses on the geographic region of Southeast Asia. This is an area dominated by the sea and more than half of the world's annual merchant tonnage passes through these waters.²⁶ There has been a great degree of historical maritime significance to this region for centuries, and the dangers that exist in this part of the world today make it even more significant as non-state political violence, piracy, and transnational maritime terrorism increase the threat to the region. The nations of Southeast Asia, in particular, Australia, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and The Philippines, have instituted cooperative maritime security initiatives to demonstrate their collective resolve against the threat. Even countries that do not directly fall in the center of the region, most notably India and Japan, have a serious stake in the economic security of the area and have taken measures to ensure that commercial vessels can navigate safely. The U.S. military, including the Navy, takes part in the annual COBRA GOLD military exercise in the region that aims to improve formal cooperation among participants to improve regional maritime security. Although the continuation of this exercise will help to enhance the capabilities of regional nations, Bradford also states that "Bilateral cooperation... can be more productive than multilateral initiatives in producing operational maritime cooperation."²⁷ Taking advantage of additional bilateral agreements, and possibly conducting naval exercises between interested states, can have a significant impact on the security of the region. It is in the best interest of the United States to promote bilateral agreements in the region between indigenous nations, and also enhance the maritime security capabilities of states through diplomatic and economic means. Only through increased cooperative efforts can this region be prepared to combat future threats to its economic livelihood.

Finally, the resources and capabilities of the U.S. Navy can increase maritime security by more fully integrating capabilities and cooperation with the U.S. Coast Guard. Much has been written on this subject, but Dobbs said it best:

By supporting the Coast Guard, the Navy can help protect America from maritime threats while maintaining an efficient flow of commerce and people. The new security environment will require all the U.S. armed services to adapt their equipment, doctrine, organizations, and training to new threats.²⁸

The events of September 11, 2001, have placed a premium on the resources and capabilities of the U.S. Coast Guard with regard to protecting the homeland and providing control of the maritime domain. The Navy has also significantly increased its operational tempo in support of combating terrorism on a global scale. As a result, the myriad of threats to maritime security are

being fought by two services that are experiencing an increase in missions and operations without any increase in personnel end strength. In order to combat the ever increasing threats to maritime security, it will become even more critical that the efforts of the Navy and the Coast Guard be synchronized and that capabilities of the services become inter-operable. Redundancies in maritime capabilities between the services may be required to provide the nation with an increased number of operational units to fill the increase in requirements. Future naval force structure may be affected if the Navy fully commits to seamless support of the Coast Guard for securing the maritime domain. Large, multi-mission ships of the present will need to be complemented by the addition of an adequate number of small, capable, and durable vessels used for conducting operations closer to shore. As mentioned previously, the littoral combat ship currently being procured by the Navy would potentially fit the bill and provide the numbers required to fill additional deployment requirements.

A top-level assessment of these proposed actions for the Navy, according to the Chief of Naval Operations' Guidance for 2006, demonstrates the Navy's future commitment to making a positive impact on maritime security. First, Admiral Mullen's vision of "steadily deepening cooperation" with emerging partners and a dedication to maintaining open sea lanes for peaceful movement of international commerce are in line with directives contained in maritime security initiatives.²⁹ Second, the desired effect of the Navy and Coast Guard working together to enhance homeland defense demonstrates a commitment to the synergy that can be achieved through integrating capabilities and cooperation. Third, the CNO has tasked his own staff and Commander, Fleet Forces Command, to develop force packages and deployment concepts that are aligned with the National Fleet policy and the *National Strategy for Maritime Security*.³⁰ Finally, to increase the Navy's contribution to the Joint Force, the Navy is tasked to develop closer working relationships with other governmental and non-governmental organizations to support Maritime Domain Awareness initiatives that are designed to enhance maritime security.³¹

Conclusion

The *National Strategy for Maritime Security* is a well written document with some moderately explicit supporting implementation plans. The strategy also does an adequate job of linking the objectives contained in the *National Security Strategy of the United States* and the *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. The United States government should allow sufficient time to fully implement the strategic actions and the supporting implementation plans before attempting to modify or significantly revamp the strategy. The key to success in defeating

terrorist threats against the United States by way of successfully defending the maritime domain will be by continuously reassessing the strategy over time and modifying as necessary. The proposed recommendations for future employment of the significant capabilities of the United States Navy are critical to the success of this strategy as our involvement around the globe requires additional means to achieve stated goals. Moderate risk is involved with the strategy as currently written and there appears to be an excellent linkage between ends, ways, and means. However, the continued economic growth and economic freedom that we as a nation hold dear will only be achievable through this strategy by transforming the U.S. Navy's capabilities and operational requirements. By continually updating our strategy and effectively utilizing the current and future capabilities of the Navy, the nation will continue to strive for security against threats from the maritime domain and enjoy economic prosperity.

Endnotes

¹ George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, D.C.: The White House, September 2002), 17.

² George W. Bush, *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (Washington, D.C.: The White House, July 2002), vii.

³ The maritime domain is defined as all areas and things of, on, under, relating to, or bordering on a sea, ocean, or other navigable waterway, including all maritime-related activities, infrastructure, people, cargo, and vessels and other conveyances.

⁴ George W. Bush, *The National Strategy for Maritime Security*, September 2005, available from http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/HSPD13_MaritimeSecurityStrategy.pdf; Internet; accessed November 14, 2005, ii.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 20.

¹¹ Joshua Ho, "Maritime Counter-Terrorism: A Singapore Perspective", available from <http://observerindia.com/reports/maritime/psingapore.pdf>; Internet, accessed February 28, 2006, 3.

¹² Rajesh Joshi, "All at Sea", November 11, 2005, available from http://www.ocnus.net/artman/publish/article_21318.shtml; Internet, accessed November 21, 2005, 2.

¹³ John F. Fritelli, "Port and Maritime Security: Background and Issues for Congress", May 2005, available from <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/homsec/RL31733.pdf>; Internet, 2006, accessed March 7, 15-16.

¹⁴ Ibid., 16.

¹⁵ Ali M. Koknar, "Maritime Terrorism: A New Challenge for NATO", January 24, 2005, available from <https://www.iags.org/n0124051.htm>; Internet; accessed November 11, 2005, 8.

¹⁶ Ibid., 3.

¹⁷ The operation's mission is to conduct naval operations in the Mediterranean to actively demonstrate NATO's resolve and solidarity. Active Endeavour's mission currently includes actions aimed at preventing or countering terrorism coming from or conducted at sea and all illegal actions possibly connected with terrorism, such as human trafficking and smuggling of arms and radioactive substances. Operation Active Endeavour eventually has become more intelligence-based by sharing intelligence and information gathered at sea with allies, to enhance their security.

¹⁸ David S. Cloud, "Navy to Expand Fleet With New Enemies in Mind", December 5, 2005, available from <https://www.nytimes.com/2005/12/05/national/05navy.html>; Internet, accessed December 6, 2005, 2.

¹⁹ James Stavridis and Frank Pandolfe, "From Sword to Shield: Naval Forces in the War on Terror", August 2004, available from https://www.military.com/Content/MoreContent1?file=NI_Navy_0804; Internet, accessed January 9, 2006, 4.

²⁰ Ibid., 6.

²¹ The Proliferation Security Initiative is based on an international coalition of countries whose purpose would be to facilitate the sharing of intelligence information, track of suspect international cargo, and conduct joint/coalition military exercises to interdict the shipments.

²² William R. Hawkins, "Interdict WMD Smugglers at Sea", December 2004, available from http://www.military.com/NewContent/0,13190,NI_1204_Sea-P1,00.html; Internet, accessed on January 9, 2006, 3.

²³ Ibid., 5.

²⁴ Richard B. Porterfield, "Naval Intelligence: Transforming to Meet the Threat", September 2005, available from http://www.military.com/Content/MoreContent1?file=NI_0905_Naval-P1,00.html; Internet, accessed on January 9, 2006, 6.

²⁵ Ibid., 6-7.

²⁶ John Bradford, "The Growing Prospects for Maritime Security Cooperation in Southeast Asia", Summer 2005, available at https://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0JIW/is_3_58/ai_n15674369; Internet, accessed on January 9, 2006, 1.

²⁷ Ibid., 11.

²⁸ Michael Dobbs, "Homeland Security...From the Sea", November 2002, available at http://www.homelandsecurity.org/journal/articles/dobbs_navy.html; Internet, accessed on November 21, 2005, 6.

²⁹ Michael G. Mullen, "CNO Guidance for 2006: Meeting the Challenge of a New Era", October 2005, available at <http://www.navy.mil/features/2006CNOG.pdf>; Internet, accessed on January 20, 2006, 1.

³⁰ Ibid., 5.

³¹ Ibid., 8.