

Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Gary Roughead delivers remarks at MAST Americas

Adm. Gary Roughead at MAST Americas 2010
Washington D.C. – June 22, 2010

Well, thank you very much. It's great to see all of you here coming together to talk about something that is extraordinarily important to all of us. And I would like to congratulate the committee for bringing this conference to fruition and also to recognize the fact that this is the first time that it has been held in the United States and I hope that is not the last.

I would like to welcome my good friend, Anders Grenstad from Sweden, a friend, a colleague and a naval officer who has so ably and professionally led his Navy for many years. But someone who truly understands the challenges and I think as you look at what he has done and the initiatives that he has put in place, he epitomizes that which we are about. So, it's good to see you. I thank you for coming all the way here. I look forward to visiting again in a not too distant future.

I would be remiss if I did not thank [VADM (ret)] J. Guy Reynolds for everything that he put into MAST and bringing this group together here in the United States. I will tell you and it comes as no surprise for those of you that know J. Guy – that his pursuit of having me on this podium was unrelenting. It was passionate, it was committed, but that's what makes good things happen. So Jan, it's great that you are here and we miss J. Guy terribly. He served our Navy, and by extension navies around the world so ably for 70 years, so thank you for that.

I'm also glad there's an education and outreach component to this event- from we in the United States Navy, I consider that to be so very important. Because the importance of the hard sciences, a term that we use 'STEM:' Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics, in our country is so important and the programs that we can put in place to encourage young men and women to pursue professions and careers in STEM is very important. And whether at the end of the day, they might join the Navy or the other Armed Forces that would be wonderful. But as long as they master STEM and take those skills and that knowledge to make our country and the world a better place; that's good enough for me, so I thank you for what you are doing here.

I think that as I talk a bit about the emerging global environment and the U.S. Navy's role in that environment, and especially how maritime partnerships play in that for a host of reasons ranging from strategic to financial to technical; that the discussion that you are going to have here is so important to putting the spotlight on something that I consider to be extremely important and significant in years ahead.

I've mentioned the work that Anders has done and clearly we have come a long way and even though it will be easy to look back on the things we've done and perhaps congratulate ourselves, in my mind, this is about looking to the future, about looking forward about the things that we should do in the future, so I look forward to sharing some thoughts with you.

We in the United States Navy, as many of you may know, have been busy. We continue to be involved in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan in ways that our Navy has not been involved before. As we sit here today there are 14,000 Sailors on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa. They are filling a variety of missions; obviously there are high-end warriors; our Navy SEALs, explosive ordinance disposal, construction battalions, medics, and just Sailors that are assigned individually to support the effort there. They are doing fantastic work day in and day out. And it gives me great pride to visit with them in many different locations. And I think J. Guy would be surprised if about a year ago on a very cold mountain in Afghanistan at about 12,000 feet, I was talking to a young Navy Commander who was leading a Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) and his prior assignment had been command of a nuclear submarine. He was having the time of his life building school, clinics, community centers and really having an effect. But I think that just goes to show the flexibility about those who wear the uniform of a Navy. It's a part of our culture and I'm not just talking about the United States Navy. It is a culture of getting things done.

We continue our at sea involvement in a more traditional capacity with our capabilities and we continue to provide upwards of 30 percent of the fixed-wing air sorties that fly over Afghanistan in support of our troops- but in the U.S. and NATO allies and coalition partners all coming from the deck of the aircraft carrier that's routinely operating off the coast of Pakistan.

Of course, our nation's interests and our Navy's interest extend far beyond Iraq and Afghanistan and we are continuing as a Navy to maintain our strategic focus on the Pacific and Indian Ocean regions and we conduct maritime security operations in the Middle East, Africa and South America.

Our force represents an ongoing deterrence and assurance through its presence and its expanding in that assurance and deterrence as we take on new roles and missions for example, our commander-in-chief recently announced the phased-adaptive approach of ballistic missile defense in Europe and Navy and AEGIS is in the forefront there and we will continue to remain in the fore front.

If we were only engaged in the places that I have mentioned, pirates would exercise free-reign in key shipping lanes. Some nations would make, and continue to make, excessive claims on natural resources in commons areas. And drug traffickers would face no obstacles in perfecting their "just in time" delivery system for illicit products that trouble all of our societies on every continent.

Further, our prospects for a viable territorial BMD capability in the NATO context- against a very real and advancing Iranian threat as evidenced by recent UN Security Council resolution- our approaches there would be much dimmer if not for the capabilities that we bring there.

So, in many ways, our interests call us to answer a more varied and challenging demand to continue delivering our great range of capabilities in sufficient capacity- and I'll come back to the word capacity many times.

We are committed through our 2007 Maritime Strategy to a strategy of engagement in the U.S. Navy, and I believe that strategy is rightfully in place. Our National Security Strategy sets requirements for a "just and sustainable" international order that we are uniquely suited to answer. The U.S. Navy has a heritage of providing credible military presence to uphold global order. It is the benefits we've seen from partnering with other like-minded navies to tackle common challenges that drove us to that conclusion in developing our maritime strategy- that conclusion of engagement.

This strategic outlook was recently reaffirmed by our Defense Department's Quadrennial Defense Review, and further refined by all three American sea services issuing the Naval Operations Concept 2010.

Simply put, we are a maritime nation and see quite clearly that the emerging global order will only ask more of maritime forces in the future.

Despite an uncertain future, sea power, as an instrument of global influence, endures.

The sea remains the domain of commerce, communication, and resources.

And even as we become more and more reliant on the internet, the term I use is that it "swims with the fishes," because every year about \$3.2 trillion moves on those cables that lie on the bottom of the ocean floor.

Sea power endures because it has proved, over the course of history, to be a flexible, adaptable, rapid reaction force that a nation can use regardless of time or situation – as long as the right capability and capacity exist. The benefit of naval forces is that they don't trigger political sensitivities; they can persist within reach and form the foundation for governments to align other elements of national power.

Now, the United States Navy does not need to do everything, nor do we want to. Global challenges require global responses, and no navy can be everywhere at once. For their part, key bilateral relationships are growing in importance as my recent trips to Saudi Arabia, Qatar, India, and several Arabian Gulf states indicate. Our enduring alliances continue to underwrite the relative peace of the international system. But their importance notwithstanding, bilateral relationships rarely achieve the kind of global maritime security broader partnerships can.

This is why we continue to emphasize the power resident in global maritime partnerships. Sovereign navies must form the foundation of those global maritime partnerships. So we welcome any increase in capacity and capability by our partners, new and old. We recognize that regional interest in maritime stability benefits the entire maritime commons, with or without U.S. involvement.

As a community of maritime professionals we have had success in building broader maritime partnerships. The International Seapower Symposium- where last October we assembled 102 nations and 91 chiefs of naval service and where we furthered a common understanding of maritime security imperatives.

The United States Navy has expanded our efforts to increase partner nation capacity in African and South American waters. In the Gulf of Aden with Task Force-151 and the counter-piracy mission, we've created what I call the strange bedfellows; we share a common interest in the security of the maritime domain.

A few years ago if you would have said Russia, China, the United States, Malaysia, India, U.A.E., NATO would all be operating together in one common cause, I'm not sure a lot of us in the room would put money on that, but that is exactly what is happening today. And in the Pacific; an example that I believe was a great spark of global maritime partnerships and the power and cooperation is Malsindo where the countries surrounding the Straits of Malacca, Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand came together to overcome a scourge of piracy there. These are all examples of how these partnerships are working. But I believe there is more to do to develop them further to achieve security gains that we seek.

I echo [NATO] Secretary General Rasmussen's call earlier this year for more practical action associated with maritime partnerships – an ongoing dialogue is no doubt important, but structures and discussion don't amount to much without commitment. We need to build on practical success at the regional and sub-regional level and begin to federate regional structures with commitment to information sharing sustained flexible participation across initiatives and regions as required, and prioritized investments in credible military power across the range of capabilities.

We need to build on practical success at the regional and sub-regional level and begin to federate regional structures with commitment to information sharing, sustained, flexible participation across initiatives and regions as required and prioritized investments in credible military power across the range of capabilities. This is the hard work of partnership, but it is also the most valuable worth of partnership.

Our Navy is on every continent and in every ocean reassuring, strengthening, and developing old and new partnerships in an effort to shape a more cooperative and collaborative maritime security environment.

In shaping that cooperative maritime environment, the currency of our partnerships, personal relationships, information sharing, and credible power – has remained stable over time and will not change.

Maritime partnerships still rely on this currency and we continue to invest in it with a capacity to engage globally and the ability to carry out the six core capabilities that we highlighted in our maritime strategy. The capabilities of being able to be forward, to deter, to provide for sea control, power projection, maritime security, proactive humanitarian assistance and disaster response.

Even as the global order changes and nations and non-state entities change, these fundamentals will not change significantly. What's changed are the finances available for all of us as we pursue a broadening and deepening of our global maritime partnerships. These changes have the potential to negatively affect the trajectory of the emerging global order if we don't tackle some tough questions and tackle them together. Here in the United States, for example, we must juxtapose the reality of compressed defense budgets against a growing demand for military and, especially naval power to maintain world order.

Without diligence, this juxtaposition could easily become a mismatch where resources are insufficient to serve our interests in global engagement.

All of us, in all countries face this to varying degree. A cursory reading of any front page of any newspaper on any day would reveal that the finances available for defense have changed.

This is a common challenge only becoming more acute and as such, I think it's time for some provocative questions, creative thinking, and new processes, but most importantly it is time to act. We started down this path programmatically when I became the Chief of Naval Operations. We truncated a major shipbuilding program, the DDG-1000. We cancelled two littoral combat ships contracts because of cost and we've moved recently to down select to one variant to be able to produce a more affordable ship for our Navy. We have canceled programs such as an underwater unmanned vehicle because it was non-producing and we've cancelled missile programs because there was no return on the investment that we were providing.

We've also changed our processes to improve the decisions we make. We've re-organized ourselves within the Navy to bring together our directors for intelligence and command and control. And to what we call the Director for Information Dominance. We've created an Information Dominance Corps where we brought specialists from all of the areas that act in the information world, and when we do that in our Navy we bring 44,000 people together, clearly a powerful force. And we focused on total ownership costs that get us to examine closely the cost of manpower and the cost of energy and we have reaffirmed with our recent budget submission the U.S. Navy's commitment to high-end capabilities with an expanded investment in maritime ballistic missile defense, continued investment in the joint strike fighter, and more solid plans for development of the replacement submarine for the Ohio Class.

Our work in maritime ballistic missile defense, in particular, we see as directly linked to partnerships and we envision the phased-adaptive approach as the U.S. contribution.

Navy capabilities have been and will continue to be at the vanguard of U.S. missile defense in an effort to extend and improve missile defense coverage for our friends and our partners and our allies. In the United States, we are in the process of reimagining naval power with cyber power and unmanned systems. We must ask ourselves some fundamental questions. Can these capabilities come from the sea? If the answer is no, I tell my team, don't even bother coming through the door. It must come from the sea.

In the more challenging case of unmanned underwater vehicles, can they endure in that underwater domain? Can these systems integrate with the fleet that we have? It's always easy to envision this new Fleet that we will build, but does it take into account the fact that the 287 ships that serve in our Navy today, in 2020, 220 of them will still be on the rolls so we can't forget about the Fleet that we have today.

Can the systems that we develop be commonly used across all platforms, commonality for logistics and supply, for example? Can the command and control system or the communication system used in one place be used in another? Are the systems we develop interoperable? Information can foster relationships but only if it can communicate freely with joint systems, our friends, and our allies and our partners. As we go into this developmental process, we have to look at the community of navies and nations with whom we will operate and make sure we're still on the same page. And how do they contribute to maritime domain awareness and the important work our National Maritime Intelligence Center does in support of the global maritime community of interest agencies and international and industrial partners?

And the biggest question I believe for all of us is what are we willing to afford? Certainly, no navy today can afford to spend its way out of this challenge. We have to think our way out and we have to maintain affordability. An extra challenge for this arena is that while it may be expensive to develop advanced technologies, they may not be expensive to acquire, to use, or to misuse.

We might have to spend a lot while potential adversaries could acquire counter-capabilities for comparatively little. This means we cannot afford a tailor-made solution to every need that we have.

Especially true for software applications that we use, we cannot afford to build a new program for every process. Sometimes we can use old ones, or even better, we can use programs that are adaptable.

I'm proud of how far the international maritime community has come, but I really believe that we must do more to solidify the gains that we've achieved today. There are more provocative questions to be asked.

Will naval forces remain sufficient to influence the new world order? Do we universally accept that the concept of what I call, watering all flowers, will be dormant for a while in this economic environment?

Do we universally accept that we face imperatives to harness the benefits of close cooperation in the maritime domain and do more of what we have agreed that for sometime is so very important.

We need to recognize that force structure commitments accrue to maritime partnerships for global security. Presence has no substitute. Virtual engagement or distance support doesn't propel maritime partnerships. In this context, the kinds of technological trends and engineering breakthroughs we explore as a group in this conference are absolutely essential. We must find ways to improve the affordability of the forces we are developing. We must exploit open architecture efficiencies, identify common components where possible, and even investigate common hull forms and common air frames as we feel the types of systems that we need for the future. And all of this will require a renewed commitment on the parts of like-minded maritime nations to maintain the capabilities, in sufficient capacity, upon which we rely.

And in conclusion, I remain confident about the path we're on together.

I'm very aware, I can assure you, I am very aware of the pressured fiscal environment within which we will all pursue valid strategic objectives, develop capabilities, and refine processes to harness the power of existing regional initiatives and technological progress. I'm positive that forums like these which bring maritime partnerships to the fore will help us all consider the implications of the emerging global order for our navies and our nations.

I thank you and I look forward to your questions.