

2006

Building Capacity through Cooperation

Rose M. Likins

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

Recommended Citation

Likins, Rose M. (2006) "Building Capacity through Cooperation," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 59 : No. 1 , Article 1.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol59/iss1/1>

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

BUILDING CAPACITY THROUGH COOPERATION

Remarks delivered as a luncheon address to the International Seapower Symposium at the Naval War College on 21 September 2005, by Ambassador Rose M. Likins

I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak to such a distinguished audience on the issue of maritime security and to share some thoughts with you about the State Department in general and about how it supports and contributes to your efforts in developing this “Global Network of Maritime Nations” that the symposium has gathered to address. My purpose is to talk about global alliances, in this case the U.S. Navy and allied and coalition navies, and to offer a series of recommendations that you may want to consider.

The core mission of the State Department is to “create a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community.” Our bilateral and multilateral relationships are integral to that mission—and many of those relationships are underpinned by strategic military alliances. One of our principal undertakings in executing this mission is building coalitions or partnerships to resolve shared problems, whether those problems are security-related, like the threats of terrorism or weapons of mass destruction, or more social and developmental issues like HIV/AIDS and trafficking in persons or building a community of democracy.

Despite the “discovery” of the phenomenon of globalization over the last several years, it has long been my belief that mariners were the first agents of globalization centuries ago, and that our planet’s oceans were the first global commons. We tend to use that term today to refer to space, to the Internet, to the air we breathe, but in fact our oceans and seas were where it all started. Those who ventured out onto them—whether motivated by the thrill of discovery, the search for riches, routine commerce, or communications—were the pioneers in creating the ties that bind us. Mariners from all corners of the globe quickly discovered that they faced common challenges and threats and developed a series of traditions and working procedures that superseded national boundaries. The imperative to rescue fellow sailors in times of distress, to mark hazards to navigation, to share

food and water with those whose vessels are disabled, and share common signaling methods are but a few examples of these maritime practices.

Today, we again face common threats and challenges in the maritime domain, and it is time for us to strive for shared methods and techniques for defeating those threats. Those threats include use of our waters for illegal activities like narcotics trafficking or trafficking in persons, unauthorized exploitation of national resources, and contamination of the environment. We all face constrained resources, and our national leaders are called upon to use those scarce resources to respond to a variety of national needs, from education to public infrastructure to national defense. We can all maximize the use of these resources by avoiding duplication of effort and cooperating to confront these common challenges.

It's not always easy. There are a multitude of obstacles ranging from the most basic, like communicating across language barriers or on different communications networks, to insufficient resources allocated to this mission, to the more complicated, like historic regional tensions over sovereignty. Together we can overcome many, if not all, of these obstacles. But we have to want to do that. It takes a conscious decision to work together.

Language and communications barriers can be overcome with technology and training. Resource constraints can be minimized by sharing missions and with the assistance of allies. Sovereignty, in contrast, is perhaps the most difficult obstacle, because nationalism appeals to strong emotions in every one of us. But we need to remember that "bad actors" violate our sovereignty every day, causing enormous social and economic damage. They consciously exploit political tensions for their own ends. How many of you have seen a vessel suspected of carrying illicit cargo or conducting illegal operations duck into the waters of another nation when it detects the approach of your own law-enforcement vessel? It literally happens every day.

Let me be clear. I am not advocating dismantling borders. We have a saying in the United States, "Good fences make good neighbors," and there is truth to that in many circumstances. What I am advocating is that we be more creative than the bad actors, that we find ways to cooperate by sharing information, communicating clearly, pooling our resources, and resolving to deny our respective national territories to our common enemies.

This may sound easy. We all know it's not. But what the United States is offering you here today is a hand extended to begin the journey.

In his 2002 National Security Strategy, President George W. Bush stated, "The greatest danger our nation faces lies at the crossroads of radicalism and technology. Our enemies have openly declared that they are seeking weapons of mass destruction, and evidence indicates that they are doing so with determination.

The United States will not allow these efforts to succeed.” That statement could not have been any truer then than it is today. In numerous subsequent fora, President Bush highlighted the need for creating new and reinforcing existing alliances and partnerships to engage in the struggle against the ideology of tyranny and terror. He and other like-minded leaders have emphasized that to confront the challenges of this malevolent entity, nations must come together to create a global vision, with a global boldness of thought and the courage to act.

Incidents at sea involving state-sponsored proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and non-state-sponsored acts of piracy on the high seas and the littorals require us all, as free nations, to rethink our maritime strategies. The blurring of the lines between the illegal act of piracy and the illicit acts of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, not to mention narcotics trafficking and poaching on fishing grounds, demands that we look beyond our own territorial borders to find a solution to the malfeasant threats to our individual and collective national security.

The sea lines of communication are the life blood of the world’s commerce. Despite technology, more than 80 percent of global trade still moves by sea, and our economies depend on the free and unimpeded movement of its share of that commerce. Further, with their emerging power-projection land forces and seemingly unending commitments, the United States and its allies depend on access to the seas to ensure their security.

Freedom of access now means more than just maritime supremacy but the awareness and control of the entire spectrum of the maritime domain as well. The concept of unimpeded sea lines of communication underpins the very meaning of an effective national security strategy—a strategy primarily based on global enlargement and global engagement.

During the Hurricane Katrina disaster relief efforts, more than 121 countries and thirteen international organizations stepped forward and offered their assistance to the United States. These offers ranged from humanitarian assistance and relief, rescue and salvage operations, and civil engineering assistance, to infrastructure repair and medical support, to name a few. The cornerstone of facilitating, coordinating, and implementing that support came from U.S. and foreign naval assets. Quickly assembling and operating at sea, the U.S. Navy put together a critical and complex sea-based command, control, and communications network to coordinate sea, land, and air resources to contain the effects and begin restoration operations. The seemingly seamless coordination of effort and ability to integrate civil and foreign capabilities underscored the maritime component’s innate ability to operate at sea under the most challenging conditions. Without question, had it not been for the rapid response and presence of those navies, especially the Canadian, Dutch, and Mexican, the disaster would

have been much worse and the number of casualties would have been significantly higher.

I mention this effort not just to pat you all on the back but to highlight the importance and universality of global international maritime cooperation. As in the 2005 tsunami recovery efforts, because of your maritime assets and capabilities the global community was able to operate at sea when land-based assets could not. That same type of coordinated, integrated, and interoperable networking is needed on a broader scale to deliver the capability that the Chief of Naval Operations proposes at this conference.

So, what is the United States doing to support this effort?

First of all, the president emphasized the criticality of maritime domain awareness in a speech in January 2002. During that speech, he stated, “The heart of the Maritime Domain Awareness program is accurate information, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance of all vessels, cargo, and people extending well beyond our traditional maritime boundaries.” Remaining true to his 2002 comments, he recently signed a critical piece of legislation—National Strategy for Maritime Security—that underscores the importance of securing the maritime domain.

Although the strategy highlights the need for national efforts, it also strongly emphasizes the vital importance of coordinating with foreign governments and international organizations and of soliciting international support for enhanced maritime security. Within the strategy, the president stressed the need to develop an overarching plan that addresses all of the components of the maritime domain—domestic, international, public, and private—a global, cross-discipline approach to the maritime domain centered on a layered, defense-in-depth framework.

When Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice began her tenure, she challenged all of us in the State Department to transform the way we think about diplomacy and to consider how we might best use our diplomatic tools to target better our responses to meet today’s threats, not the threats of yesterday. As Secretary Rice told the department in her first “town hall” meeting, “Transformational diplomacy is not easy. It means taking on new tasks, breaking old habits, working with people who are also trying to make those transformations themselves, and being partners with those around the world who share our values and want to improve their lives.” She was right. Diplomatic efforts dealing with the issues of counterproliferation and conventional military threats have very little resemblance to those of the past. During the Cold War era, we had the luxury of time to deliberate and debate foreign policy and develop foreign-policy-related measures. Those days are past.

Today, we as diplomats and senior military planners must primarily work to build a sound and enduring basis of support to coordinate and respond rapidly when actionable proliferation-related intelligence and law enforcement information becomes available, and we must be prepared to adapt and change when the situation demands.

During a time of constrained resources, the United States realizes that not all nations can readily invest capital—human, intellect, and financial—in the concepts required to deliver the required capabilities. That is why the United States remains committed to key military foreign assistance programs—International Military Education and Training, Foreign Military Financing, and the Peacekeeping Operations Account. In 2001 the United States contributed over \$3.75 billion to 114 countries, and in 2004 it contributed over five billion dollars to over 140 countries in these three programs alone.

The International Military Education and Training (IMET) program, a low-cost, high-yield, effective component of U.S. security assistance, provides training on a grant basis to students from over 140 allied and friendly nations. IMET not only furthers American national interest but advances international interest by establishing beneficial military-to-military relations that culminate in increased understanding and defense cooperation.

Foreign Military Financing (FMF) advances regional stability through coalition partners that are equipped and trained to achieve common security goals. Funds provided through this program enable our international partners to improve their military capabilities. Related to but distinct from FMF is the Foreign Military Sales Program (FMS). FMS is the system that manages government-to-government military equipment sales. Although many countries provide their own financing for purchases through the FMS system, the FMF program provides grants for acquisition.

Finally, but not least, there is the Peacekeeping Operations Account (PKO). These funds support multilateral peacekeeping and regional stability operations that are not funded through the United Nations. They help to support regional peace-support operations for which neighboring countries take primary responsibility. PKO is also used to enhance and develop peacekeeping capability so countries are better able to undertake these operations. We are proud to be able to empower regional leaders to act on behalf of their neighbors in providing stability within their perspective regions.

In allocating these resources, we place a premium on the wise use of resources and willingness to engage. In other words, we are willing to help those who help themselves.

What are the challenges for you that lie ahead?

First, you must continue to make a strong case to your leaders to invest the resources and cooperate in regional security initiatives. This includes programs, operations, and exercises. Programs such as the Regional Maritime Security Cooperation (RMSC) initiative, previously known as the Regional Maritime Security Initiative (RMSI), are excellent examples of countries developing initiatives and programs to counter specific threats within their regions. The RMSC protects the critical choke points within the Malacca Strait and its littorals, through which more than half the world's oil and a third of the world's trade pass.

On a broader scale, the Proliferations Security Initiative (PSI) is a prime example of multinational initiatives to combat global threats. I know that Admiral Mullen mentioned PSI during his remarks at this symposium, but allow me to echo his sentiment on this critical initiative that addresses trafficking of WMD and their means of delivery by sea, land, and air. "The WMD proliferation landscape," he told us, "is dynamic and flexible." Our response to the threat must also be flexible, adaptive, and evolutionary so as not only to keep pace but to outpace those desiring and attempting to proliferate weapons of mass destruction. The Proliferation Security Initiative is unique in that it taps into each participant's national authorities and capabilities to create a global web of actions against the traffic in WMD. PSI has fostered, globally, a basis for practical steps to quickly respond when we or our partners obtain information of proliferation shipments. The impact of states working together in a deliberately cooperative manner is far greater than that of states acting alone. Currently, more than sixty states have indicated support for the Proliferation Security Initiative—and we encourage others to endorse the PSI Statement of Interdiction Principles that creates the framework for PSI action.

In summary, let me say that harnessing the power of the international community in ways that are in the interests of individual nations, will not be an easy task, especially given other competing domestic and national interests. That is why I hope that when you leave this symposium you will feel empowered to return to your leaders and emphasize how critical this collaboration is for the future of all nations. It is also imperative that you engage to the maximum extent possible in those initiatives within your regions that support global stability by participating in, and if necessary hosting, regional talks, exercises, and operations like those previously mentioned. Finally, I encourage you to maintain an open dialogue with your counterparts here today and to encourage your governments to do the same, particularly in their efforts to build international outreach programs for partnering with the global community. As you grapple with the issues of how to promote naval collaboration, build a common picture of maritime activity, and define the required maritime security capabilities, I hope you

will find that this event has reinforced the commitment of the United States to assisting you.

Let me close with a statement by our previous secretary of state, retired General Colin Powell, one that sums up the situation that we find ourselves facing:

There is no country on earth that is not touched by America, for we have become the motive force for freedom and democracy in the world. And there is no country in the world that does not touch us. We are a country of countries with a citizen in our ranks from every land. We are attached by a thousand cords to the world at large, to its teeming cities, to its remotest regions, to its oldest civilizations, to its newest cries for freedom. This means that we have an interest in every place on this earth; that we need to lead, to guide, to help in every country that has a desire to be free, open and prosperous.

AMBASSADOR ROSE M. LIKINS

Ambassador Likins was appointed Acting Assistant Secretary, Political-Military Affairs, U.S. State Department, on 20 January 2005.