

**Chief of Naval Operations  
Adm. Gary Roughead delivers remarks at the  
Current Strategy Forum  
June 7, 2011**

Thanks John for the introduction and it's good to see so many here this afternoon and also so many good friends from times past. I'd like to thank John and his staff for making the Current Strategy Forum possible. I think all of us who have any dealings whatsoever with symposiums realize that there's a lot of work that goes on behind the scenes. So John thanks for all that you did and that of your staff. I normally come to the current strategy forum and stay for the duration because I really do get a lot out of just listening to the great speakers and the great panelists, and the questions quite frankly are some of the most insightful that I receive, so I do like to stay for the course. Regrettably, there's some things going on back in Washington and it's always good to be around the table particularly when they are talking about budget. And then I am off here for some international travel but I know it is going to be a great session here and I thank you all for coming.

It really is a pleasure for me to return again to the Naval War College – the term I use, the Navy's home of thought and what is my fourth and final Current Strategy Forum. I think that it's fitting to come together at times like this to return our focus to something that all seafarers consider fundamental to their daily lives, to their plans and preparations and indeed to how we see the world. Energy: where we get it from, how we move it, how we use, indeed even how we re-use it, and how far it takes us in the pursuit of America's objectives is a topic that I think we cannot afford not to engage on.

I'd like to thank the Navy's Task Force Energy and the work that they have done since 2008, when we formed that task force as a result of what we saw in record oil prices that gave us a glimpse into the vulnerabilities that are inherent in what I think will be ever-rising fuel costs. So I would like to thank the leadership of that initiative, some of whom are here today, Vice Admiral Bill Burke who leads the primary organization under which we've chartered Task Force Energy. Clearly Rear Admiral Phil Cullom, who I was with this morning in Washington as we recognized our Navy commands for their environmental stewardship, and also Rear Admiral Dave Titley, who's our oceanographer of the Navy, who has really changed the discussion and the debate in how we in the Navy, and indeed nationally, are looking at energy and climate issues. But this discussion that we've had as a result of Task Force Energy and Task Force Climate Change has really changed and benefitted greatly from the Secretary of the Navy's advocacy since he came into office a couple of years ago. And I think it is a discussion that continues on today in the context of considerable budget pressure for all facets of government, something that urges awareness and active participation on our part so that we may continue with the aggressive initiatives to which we remain committed, and which gain relevance as the scope of this pressure that we're going to face becomes clearer.

The Navy's leadership in this discussion is at once a reflection that we, perhaps unlike any other service, live in the interplay between natural resources and their global strategic consequences, and also serves to emphasize how considerable those consequences stand to be for a maritime nation that aims to lead through – and well beyond – the tests we face today. We in the Navy view security through the lens of energy, and understand implicitly that our access to energy sources we use today, oil and gas primarily, is anything but

guaranteed. We're well aware that the supply is not always going to meet demand, and developing trends promise new sources of conflict as they relate to energy. Limited access to fresh water, dwindling agricultural yields, overfishing, mass migrations, and climate change will continue to stress the global order just as energy resources become more dear, and this will pull us in several directions when we rather might have more space and time to address America's dependence on imported resources on our own terms.

We watch these trends with a sense of urgency because they affect the Navy's energy future, but also because we believe wholeheartedly the future will need our Navy. I spoke here last year of international order as the indispensable factor in global prosperity and peace, and how the Navy serves to guarantee the benefits we derive from a globalized world in which tangible goods, resources, or the electrons that facilitate the exchange of ideas and commerce in a digital age move on the world's oceans. To the extent that those benefits are more prone to disruption and disorder, the uniquely diplomatic and preventive aspects of sea power will come to be better recognized in more nations. More will see that there is good we can and must do from the sea, and that we are thinking anew about how to sustain our contributions globally. As we lay out our potential investments in national security and make decisions affecting the Navy of the future, we must take a realistic view of that future and ensure a dominant fleet continues to provide the foundation for the type of American presence, involvement, and credibility the American people require.

With more than 65,000 Sailors and about 40% of our Navy deployed globally on any given day, our Navy maintains America's forward presence, engages with partners, and provides offshore options in ways only naval forces do. The Navy's small footprint offshore, and flexible range of capabilities, gives our nation attractive options to influence events by assuring, shaping, responding to crisis, and employing force when needed. They allow the United States to remain globally engaged with partners, and ensure our access wherever our nation's interests might dwell. While our ships are mobile and able to surge on short notice, it is our persistent forward presence that allows for the speed and flexibility of response the nation has called upon repeatedly over the last two decades, and most recently in Libya and Japan.

Off Libya, *deployed* ships and submarines broke off their patrol and maritime ballistic defense missions to deliver Tomahawk missiles against radar and command and control sites, creating in short order the conditions under which a no-fly zone could be imposed. Off Japan, the *deployed* Ronald Reagan strike group responded immediately to a natural disaster there, with helicopter flights to deliver humanitarian aid and medical capabilities, with nuclear expertise and heavy lift to participate in the relief effort. Our recent history, current events, and ongoing operations indicate that the demand for the capability and capacity to respond across the range of possible operations may well increase in coming years. Developments in the broader Middle East are still evolving, where our presence in those seas is so important and our demonstrated maritime commitment to the nations of the Western Pacific adds stability to the only region where countries with unresolved disputes are building world-class navies. There should be little surprise among this group that our attention is drawn to presence in the crucial sea lanes of these two regions, and to the normative and international legal underpinnings of that presence in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

We tend to focus on anti-access and area denial capabilities development, but anti-access practices in the maritime domain are also expanding. Today some 35 countries claim territorial water-type jurisdiction over exclusive economic zones, contrary to customary law, and as you might imagine many of these anti-access practices relate to resource extraction. A new venue for global resource competition is also opening in the Arctic – what we refer to when discussing the impact of climate change as the opening of the 'Fifth Ocean' –

something that hasn't happened since the end of the Ice Age. Efforts are already underway – and not just among the Arctic nations – to seize the economic potential of a region that is estimated by the U.S. Geological Survey to contain around 22% of the world's oil and natural gas resource base. Our Navy has been positioned exceedingly well to answer the nation's needs as a Joint, interagency, and international partner in a more networked world, but forward presence requires fuel. Whether we see the new energy options we pursue today to fruition will affect how well we contend with growing operational demand at the same time the sustainability of our force is confronted in new ways.

We've been pushing our current fleet hard for the last decade to conduct varied and simultaneous operations on a continuous basis, and the challenges which make this time different for our Navy persist in the form of new fundamentals that we will not be able to address by staying wedded to our past. These new fundamentals in the fields of manpower, procurement, research and development, and information technologies will inform what is possible and likely require disruptive change to accommodate. Energy forms a critical element in our response to these realities – from the operating cost reductions we aim for with hybrid-electric drives and 'drop-in' fuel alternatives, to the long-duration, shipboard safe unmanned underwater vehicle power that we are currently researching aggressively. Beyond fuel alternatives for total ownership cost reduction, energy access and security considerations have informed the Navy's pursuit of unmanned integration into the fleet we have today, and the institutionalization of our Navy's already considerable information dominance capabilities for military competitions that now extend well into the domain of cyberspace.

And while not yet upon us, the challenge posed by the widespread surface combatant and submarine retirements of the 2020's will remind us that our nation's shipbuilding industrial base – to include second and third tier suppliers, and nuclear as well as conventional suppliers – must be included as partners in bringing to the fleet the new energy solutions we need to secure America's asymmetric advantages for an uncertain future. While we stand little chance as a single service of making a new energy market in the near term, we have shown the foresight, once again, to be a motive force in wider technological advancements, to be the early adopters of energy solutions that carry with them the prospects to re-imagine the capacity with which we execute the core capabilities of our Navy.

This is important, because the first and foundational aspect of how America answers the responsibilities and obligations of international leadership is through sea power. American sea power must remain credible globally as it has been since the late 19th century, and dominant as it has been for the last seven decades. And it must assure allies and enduring partners if it is to prevent war. The Secretary of Defense recently reminded an audience of college graduates how many countries seek deeper ties with the United States through our military. How, in the midst of some of the most pressing economic challenges and the most important domestic decision points this nation has faced since it assumed the mantle of leadership, more countries in our world than ever look to us for leadership than ever before. If we are not to disappoint our friends – not to miss the opportunity that remains to set the international system on a path to greater peace in this century – America must come to terms with how it will afford the price of responsibility.

Will we make the tough decisions to lay bare the prevailing currents of national strategy, and apply the resources at hand to our lasting advantage? Or will we try to buy more time to decide, and in the process divest the unique American endowments we speak of because none of us remembers a time before we were able to, at will, advance our interests globally by the dint of presence, access, and dominance at sea? Energy

efficiency, energy alternatives, energy independence – as tactical imperatives with the most pervasive strategic implications – reside at the heart of how America will afford its future leadership. Navy's direction in the field of energy should serve as yet another indication of where the price of responsibility has been set, and what options real energy security tomorrow might unveil with which our great nation might navigate this period of change and challenge as successfully as it has in the past.

Thank you very much and I look forward to your questions.