



Rear Admiral Jacob L. Shuford was commissioned in 1974 from the Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of South Carolina. His initial assignment was to USS Blakely (FF 1072). In 1979, following a tour as Operations and Plans Officer for Commander, Naval Forces Korea, he was selected as an Olmsted Scholar and studied two years in France at the Paris Institute of Political Science. He also holds master's degrees in public administration (finance) from Harvard and in national security and strategic studies from the Naval War College, where he graduated with highest distinction.

After completing department head tours in USS Deyo (DD 989) and in USS Mahan (DDG 42), he commanded USS Aries (PHM 5). His first tour in Washington included assignments to the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations and to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, as speechwriter, special assistant, and personal aide to the Secretary.

Rear Admiral Shuford returned to sea in 1992 to command USS Rodney M. Davis (FFG 60). He assumed command of USS Gettysburg (CG 64) in January 1998, deploying ten months later to Fifth and Sixth Fleet operating areas as Air Warfare Commander (AWC) for the USS Enterprise Strike Group. The ship was awarded the Battle Efficiency "E" for Cruiser Destroyer Group 12.

Returning to the Pentagon and the Navy Staff, he directed the Surface Combatant Force Level Study. Following this task, he was assigned to the Plans and Policy Division as chief of staff of the Navy's Roles and Missions Organization. He finished his most recent Pentagon tour as a division chief in J8—the Force Structure, Resources and Assessments Directorate of the Joint Staff—primarily in the theater air and missile defense mission area. His most recent Washington assignment was to the Office of Legislative Affairs as Director of Senate Liaison.

In October 2001 he assumed duties as Assistant Commander, Navy Personnel Command for Distribution. Rear Admiral Shuford assumed command of the Abraham Lincoln Carrier Strike Group in August 2003. He became the fifty-first President of the Naval War College on 12 August 2004.

PRESIDENT'S FORUM



A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower

AS MOST OF YOU ARE WELL AWARE, for over a century the College has played a unique role in the analysis and formulation of national maritime strategy and policy as well as national grand strategy. Over the past two years, the Naval War College has found itself once again in a key position to support the leadership of our maritime forces, and of those of our global partners, in thinking through the implications of a new set of global security challenges and opportunities (see the “President’s Forum” in the Autumn 2006 issue of the *Review*). The current effort finds its roots in the discussions of the 17th International Seapower Symposium (ISS), held in the fall of 2005.

At that conference, fifty-five chiefs of navies and coast guards, along with twenty-seven war college presidents from around the world, gathered in Newport to share perspectives on a broad range of issues important to our navies, coast guards, and countries through the mechanism of regionally oriented seminars (eight of them). The two days produced from each region comprehensive lists of key concerns, the similarity of which was remarkable. As the symposium drew to a close, a consensus was articulated that maritime security was fundamental to address these concerns, that the scope of security challenges reached beyond the waters of individual nations, and most importantly, that responsibility for the maritime domain—the great “commons” of the world—was shared. Moreover, the need was expressed for regional and global mechanisms that would allow maritime nations to bring more routinely and effectively their particular capabilities together to ensure a free and secure maritime domain.

The host of that ISS, Admiral Mike Mullen, summarized the key proposition of the symposium: “Because today’s challenges are global in nature, we must be collective in our response. We are bound together in our dependence on the seas

and in our need for security for the vast commons. This is a requisite for national security, global stability, and economic prosperity.” Acknowledging that “the United States Navy cannot, by itself, preserve the freedom and security of the entire maritime domain,” Admiral Mullen said that “it must count on assistance from like-minded nations interested in using the sea for lawful purposes and precluding its use by others that threaten national, regional, or global security.” So too must each nation count on contributions from other nations.

Then began a very productive period, when the College—aligned with the fundamental notions of the 17th International Seapower Symposium—was tasked to work on a new maritime strategy “*of and for its time.*” Critical to our effort to rethink maritime strategy has been an extensive scenario analysis and war-gaming effort and a series of high-level conferences, symposia, and other professional exchanges with maritime partners here in Newport and other venues around the world. This collaborative effort has produced great insight and has brought into focus the diverse perspectives necessary to make this strategy robust across multiple challenges and useful both for Navy leadership and national policy makers in understanding the key role maritime forces must play in the evolving international system.

We see some powerful ideas in this strategy: the preeminent value of maritime forces to underwrite stability for the global system, and an emphasis on the unique capabilities inherent in maritime forces to prevent global shocks and to limit and localize regional conflict. Over and above the long-standing naval commitment to provide high-end military capability, there are clear new demands related to sustaining the global system—demands that are peculiar to the maritime domain. The new maritime strategy also recognizes that we must rely increasingly, across the range of military operations, on an expanded set of more robust, global maritime relationships—in effect, partnerships that engender trust, contribute to war prevention, and yield more effective maritime security.

At the 18th International Seapower Symposium, hosted here at the College in October 2007, General James Conway, Commandant of the Marine Corps; Admiral Thad Allen, Commandant of the Coast Guard; and Admiral Gary Roughead, our new Chief of Naval Operations, presented before the largest gathering of high-ranking naval leadership ever assembled in the world the results of the work of the last two years. Present in Spruance Auditorium were sixty-nine chiefs of naval operations, twenty-one commandants of coast guards, sixteen war college presidents, and many senior uniformed and civilian leaders from the United States. (I should note that nearly a quarter of our foreign guests were graduates of the College!) In all, ninety-eight countries were represented, and the event—with the three service chiefs presiding—was televised to the national security press corps in the Pentagon.

The strategy they presented (printed in its entirety in this issue) provides a long-needed, overarching logic that links the vital contribution of the nation's maritime services to global security and prosperity.

This has truly been an international collaborative effort. Many, if not most, of the navies represented at the 2007 ISS were engaged in some fashion during the strategy's development, and its substance and wording were significantly influenced by these discussions and inputs. If the initial reception by the heads of navies in attendance is any indication, the new strategy will provide a sound basis for achieving the vision of global maritime cooperation on an unprecedented scale.

The new strategy also reflects the extensive collaboration with the Navy's maritime service partners. The three sea services have worked on the strategy as an integrated team from the very first. All three service chiefs have signed the document; it truly represents a *national maritime* strategy. This collaboration also extended to the staffs of our joint combatant commanders and the U.S. interagency arena.

The strategy's rollout at Newport underscores the unique role the College plays in enabling genuine collaboration among the other sea services, international navies, and a host of other organizations. In fact, it was the formation of new relationships and the strengthening of existing ones that compelled the development of the new strategy. On the basis of the open sharing of information and of respect for the perspectives and ideas of all, the College was able to integrate the thinking of a wide range of people who would not ordinarily have an opportunity to exchange views. This synthesis of diverse perspectives embodies the philosophy behind the strategy itself, so in a sense the development of the strategy was also a step in its execution.

As I have outlined, this has been a very different kind of strategy development process. In the words of Paul Bracken, "It represents a break with recent U.S. strategic thinking in that it did not start with the answer."* I am not saying that we started with a completely blank sheet of paper, but we did free ourselves from preexisting biases on desired fleet size or shape. In fact, we all but banned any discussion of ships, submarines, or aircraft, focusing instead on the relationship between grand strategy and seapower. By maintaining that discipline throughout the project, I think we achieved one of the going-in goals—that is, to elevate the discussion in order to create a broader definition of seapower. I anticipate that *A Cooperative Strategy* will be an influential document for years to come. Part of its influence will be due to the way we went about crafting it, giving it a joint, interagency, and international pedigree, as well as solid intellectual underpinnings to make it robust and durable. From the very beginning we were intent

* Paul Bracken, "Maritime Strategy and Grand Strategy," *Chinfo News Clips*, 29 September 2006.

on taking the “long view,” to borrow from the title of Peter Schwartz’s book,* and we applied Schwartz’s idea of a “strategic conversation” with a broad range of expert stakeholders around the nation and the world.

Despite the strategy’s strong pedigree, I don’t think anyone would consider it a finished product in the sense that we can now put it in a drawer and go on to other things. Quite the contrary—if history is any guide, it will be a number of years before the implications of the new strategy are completely understood. It took several decades for us to sort out the program and resource implications of War Plan ORANGE, and the 1980s Maritime Strategy was still being refined and interpreted when the Soviet Union fell. Thus, I would expect that we will be discussing, analyzing, arguing, and gaming the new strategy for several years.

The College will have a significant role in all of these efforts, including involvement in the Navy’s new Adaptive Planning Process, which seeks to establish systematically a strategic “front end” for the requirements process in the Pentagon. Among other activities, the College will reenter the arena of “Title X” war gaming, whereby services can examine, integrate, and evolve their future concepts. The Naval War College was the originator of this type of game in the late 1970s, with its “Global” series. Whereas the Global games actually preceded and informed the 1980s Maritime Strategy, this new maritime strategy will set in motion a new series of strategy and concept games to translate the document effectively into operational, policy, and resource contexts.

I fully expect this national and international dialogue on strategy to continue, building on the work of the last two years and the investment of honest and expert intellectual capital it represents.

J. L. SHUFORD

Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy
President, Naval War College

* *The Art of the Long View: Planning for the Future in an Uncertain World* (New York: Doubleday/Currency, 1991).