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Executive Summary

Over the course of the last decade, we have witnessed a rise in the level of engagement with issues of maritime policy and strategy in many countries around the world. The motives for this have been global processes that magnify the importance of the seas and oceans as a common domain that has strategic importance for the world’s states and that is related to all issues of global trade, economy, energy, and the passage of goods and people from one end of the world to another.

In addition to these processes, there has been a major improvement in the ability of technologies to track, develop, and exploit natural resources that lie deep within the ocean and underground, including in areas that were once difficult to access.

In Israel, the issue of maritime policy and strategy has been raised in the context of conferences held by the Reuven Chaikin Chair in Geostrategy at the University of Haifa, for instance, at the 2015 Haifa Conference and at other conferences that dealt with the maritime arena.

In 2012, the Mediterranean Sea Research Center of Israel was established. It is an association of seven research universities, one college, and two government research institutes, all operating under the guidance of the University of Haifa. Among its goals is to create dialogue and generate thinking processes on sea-related affairs.

Under the University of Haifa’s guidance, all of these centers are working to engage a variety of scientific, technological, and economic challenges, as well as the security and environmental challenges that are associated with the massive development of the sea.

The crux of the activities of the Mediterranean Sea Research Center of Israel is focused on developing and safeguarding advanced and innovative research infrastructure needed for maritime research. It is also working to develop a group of academic researchers in the maritime science field, to develop and expand the scientific national database in the maritime science field, and to create sustainable development of the State of Israel’s national natural resources in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean Sea.

In 2016, the administrative council of the University of Haifa authorized the establishment of the Haifa Research Center for Maritime Policy and Strategy directing it to research issues of regional security and foreign policy, shipping and trade, human resources for the maritime domain, and further explore legal, energy, and environmental issues. Simultaneously, the Center is tasked with examining the influence of these factors on the State of Israel’s national security.
The Center set itself the objective of conducting academic research as part of the University of Haifa's effort to lead national research in the maritime field, alongside its ambition to become a center of knowledge for policy makers, public leaders, and the Israeli public, and integrating itself into the public dialogue. This includes distributing policy papers, holding symposiums, joining international discourse, and making media appearances. In addition, the Center has begun creating joint research relationships with leading knowledge centers in this field around the world, and training young researchers in a range of maritime strategy fields.

The Strategic Evaluation of a Grand Maritime Strategy for Israel 2016 was distributed in January 2016 by the Haifa Research Center for Maritime Policy and Strategy. Its recommendations included creating "an organized process, which begins with identifying the State of Israel's interests in this field, and setting priorities on all issues tied to the sea. After carrying out these first two clauses, it will be possible to formulate a grand maritime strategy accordingly, which will include defined objectives and the ways to realize them."

This document is a first attempt at this effort, which we hope will herald many more developments in the State of Israel's engagement with the maritime domain.

The global maritime arena has seen new challenges develop alongside geostrategic changes among the powers following the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Soviet Union, and the conversion of the United States into a sole superpower. In the last decade, local powers such as China and India have developed global strategies, whereas in the past, they made due with wielding local influence. These changes stem from the fact that their needs obligate them to look at the global arena as part of their playing field. The Russian Federation has also returned to the maritime playing field as the third most powerful sea power.

Smaller countries need to shape their strategies in such a way that will enable them to integrate with the global system and deal with the challenges and changes in this dynamic global environment.

A change in legislation and the United Nations Conventions on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) created a basis for cooperation, and also required new strategic coordination that will allow states to fully and optimally utilize the resources that exist in the maritime arena in their control and in their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs).

The State of Israel does not have a defined grand policy and strategy, and this is even more true regarding a grand maritime strategy that will provide a solution to the challenges in the maritime domain in a manner that takes into account all of the national needs and interests for a period of years and that creates sustainability for future generations.
through a long-term vision. This gap can be felt in all matters linked to the building of naval power, which occurs opportunistically instead of being done in an organized manner and in a way that is linked to a fundamental approach.

In addition, the lack of a suitable maritime strategy affects decision-making in the field of energy and gas in the maritime arena, as well as all matters tied to the construction of advanced ports, an Israeli trading ship fleet that will provide a response to the challenges facing the country, and the issue of sea-based infrastructure, which includes, among others, the issue of artificial islands. If Israel wishes to be a significant player in global development, and in the maritime domain specifically, the state should define a grand maritime strategy and develop the maritime domain in all of its aspects, using a wide and long-term perspective.

This work is based on a wide-ranging comparative study of other countries' maritime strategies as well as conversations and interviews with people who have dealt with strategic thinking and the writing of grand policies in Israel, including Professor Uzi Arad, Mr. Ron Eldadi. In addition to these interviews, we held a seminar headed by Prof. Shaul Horev and Admiral (Ret.) Ami Ayalon, together with experts from the Center and from the University of Haifa, to receive feedback and additional insights.

The topic was presented before a conference of former Navy Chiefs, and at the Chaikin Chair Conference in January 2017. The goal of this work is to propose a model and methodology for the building of a grand maritime strategy for Israel, after which, state institutions could build and then define this strategy.

The comparative study found that there are three principle strategies:
1. Area Denial, Access Denial
2. Engagement (Cooperation) Strategy
3. Reform Strategy

The United States enacts an engagement strategy, such as its ties to Europe and NATO countries, and it sometimes acts according to a reform strategy, as it did successfully after World War II in Germany and Japan, and recently, in a failed attempt at reform in Iraq. The area denial/access denial strategy is being activated mainly by China and Russia in their takeover of territories, the creation of islands, and the creation of facts on the ground that ensure their control in a sector, and the prevention of others from using the same area. The European Union has defined a grand maritime strategy of blue growth, intended to strengthen the European economy via the sea. Many countries in Europe have written their own strategies as a derivative of the European Union's
overall strategy, as well as economic and security issues. Their main model is one of engagement strategy.

Israel requires a grand maritime strategy that suits its unique needs and sensitive geostrategic-security situation in the eastern Mediterranean. Israel's strategic location between continents and between seas has created a special role for it in the history of the nations of the world. Israel's location has not changed, but the geostrategic environment has greatly changed over the years. It is now in a state of instability regarding the countries around Israel's borders, particularly Syria and Lebanon, which are experiencing internal wars; a lack of governance in substantial areas; a lack of clarity regarding the stability of Egypt; and a high potential for instability in Jordan.

All of these, together with continuous friction with the Palestinians and with Iran and its nuclear program waiting in the background for the window of opportunity to burst forward toward activation, obligate Israel to weigh its steps carefully and to act to strengthen Israel's national security and economy. An assessment of Israel's situation finds that the model for a grand maritime strategy that is suitable for it is the engagement model, but that under certain circumstances, Israel will have to use the denial strategy.

The methodology and entire process need to be built along three central and integrated channels that support one another: government support, a maritime cluster, and a research body.

The first course of action is to lead a process at the government level, from the top down. In line with the current structure that exists today, it seems right for this process to be led by the National Security Council. Other government ministries that must supply input for building a strategy are: the Ministries of Energy, Transport - Administration of Shipping, Foreign Affairs, Environmental Protection, Agriculture (fishing and sea farming), Tourism, Defense, Finance, and Strategic Affairs.

The second course of action is the creation of a maritime cluster that will house most of the interested parties and that will create the dialogue and the most updated assessment on the maritime arena. This can lead to an expectation of high quality awareness that will enable decision-making based on professional and updated information and cumulative knowledge.

The third path to action is to set up a supporting research body that will deal with the field of maritime strategy, which will accompany and support academic research for all those engaging the issue. In light of the existence of the Mediterranean Sea Research Center of Israel at the University of Haifa, which houses the Haifa Research Center for Maritime Policy and Strategy, setting it as the research body would be the right thing to do.
This methodology is designed to enable Israel to define a grand maritime strategy that will lead to economic growth and profit for Israel, which would be nourished from the maritime domain and all of its aspects. There is a need to set out on this path now because Israel could find itself in a position in which it has no influence and cannot utilize the maritime domain, a development that would harm its future at a time when countries and powers around it are designing strategies and acting to realize them. They could be doing this without taking Israeli interests into consideration, or they may even be acting contrary to them.

This research study was requested by the Haifa Research Center for Maritime Policy and Strategy at the University of Haifa, and made possible by the generous assistance of Mr. Dov Shafir, who is a passionate advocate of the Center’s work.

Shakked Dabran, a political science and international relations student at the University of Haifa, contributed to this research by gathering a large quantity of material that served as the basis for the information in the study and took part in the writing of this document.

I would like to offer a special thanks to Prof. Shaul Chorev, Head of the Haifa Research Center for Maritime Policy and Strategy, whose vision and great experience in the field of strategy development and geopolitical thinking formed the fertile ground for the discourse and thinking that went into this study.
Historical Background – The Importance of the Maritime Arena in Israel

During the days of King Solomon (and King David before him), ruler of the ancient Kingdom of Israel (1020 to 940 BCE), cooperation existed between the Israelites and King Hiram, ruler of the Tyre Phoenician city-state in modern-day Lebanon.

This cooperation extended to the Red Sea and the sending of ships to distant lands (called Tarshish and Ophir in the Bible, whose modern day locations are unknown).

During the days of the Second Temple, the Jewish residents of the Land of Israel did not have a clear affiliation with the sea. The Greek coastal cities and the ancient Mediterranean Phoenician cities were well-based for hundreds of years, and prevented a connection between the Mediterranean Sea and the Kingdoms of Judah and Israel. The connection between the Jews and the sea found expression mainly after the Hasmonean revolt.

The Hasmonean period, unlike the periods that came before it, was marked by an ambition to reach the coastline and set up free access to the sea, which was seen as a strategic, economic, and political asset. The conquest of Jaffa by Shimon the Hasmonean was a turn of events in terms of the connection between the Jews of the Land of Israel and the sea. The designation of Jaffa as an access port to the sea presents a clear clue regarding the trade ties between the Land of Israel's coastline and the neighboring Mediterranean countries, and perhaps also to ties with Jewish Diaspora communities.

The Hasmonean revolt served as a key development that brought the Jews closer to the sea, as it resulted in the settling of coastal cities and the ports, and the expansion of the previously limited borders of the state of Judea.¹

An additional affiliation between Israel and the maritime arena occurred in the year 37 BCE, when King Herod consolidated his kingdom and took control of Jerusalem. His rule over the whole of the Land of Israel, including the coastal plain, allowed Herod to develop a new policy that looked to the sea. Due to wide considerations that included strategic, political, and economic dimensions, Herod decided to build a deep water port in Caesarea.

The need to import wheat to the Land of Israel via the sea was one of the important and main considerations that guided him to this decision. The days of Herod in the Land

---

¹ Salant, 2015
of Israel were marked by significant growth in Mediterranean trade under the Roman leadership of Emperor Augustus.²

King Herod also saw the importance of developing sea trade in the Land of Israel, and perhaps even wanted to be a competing element with the port of Alexandria, which was a gateway to the Mediterranean, and to the eastern trade of the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean. Herod understood the importance of the sea, both from a diplomatic and an economic perspective. It can be stated with certainty that during Herod's rule, a process began in which Israel became integrated in Rome's economy and in the Mediterranean economy.

A big part of the trade ran through the sea, and the Jews began to own ships. The involvement of Jewish ship owners in maritime trade is also mentioned in the Mishna (the compiled texts of Jewish oral traditions).

Rabbi Yehuda Hanasi designated a halakhic (Jewish law) stance that was preferential to Greek and Roman cities in the Land of Israel. Rabbi Yehuda Hanasi's actions enabled the Jews to trade with port cities like Ashkelon, Caesarea, and Acre.

The link between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel was mainly via the sea (with the exception of Babylon). The sea journeys were under the influence of Roman culture and turned the Mediterranean Sea into a single economic and culture entity. Jewish sages also traveled by sea.

Engagement with sea trade occurred on the basis of trade that was founded on financial loans to send goods overseas, across the Mediterranean region, a technique that created business and personal ties. This was something that could have provided Jewish traders with an advantage.³

It is, therefore, possible to see the beginnings of the ties between the Land of Israel and the sea as early as the ancient periods. The strategic importance of the sea has always been recognized in our area, and this found expression in political, military, and economic ways. The sea was perceived as highly important by leaders such as the Hasmoneans and Herod, as well as by the sages of the Mishna, such as Rabbi Yehuda Hanasi. The sea is an asset, and this was already understood and acted upon back then.

After the Second Temple Period, the Jewish nation was forced into exile and scattered to the four corners of the earth. After a period of two thousand years in exile, the nation returned, and with it, the idea of the importance of the sea returned. With the start of

² ibd
³ ibd
the Jewish settlement “for the Zionist movement, which sought to bring in the Jewish Diaspora to the Land of Israel, the sea served as a ‘region beyond.’ The sea was not perceived as being part of the building of the nation, but rather, as a part that was subservient to the land. Zionist literature, for example, emphasized national renewal on the land. As a founding Zionist ethos, the Hebrew worker was focused on working the land, while the place of the sea was absent.”

The first sparks and ideas of a Zionist sea culture for the new Jewish pre-state population began to take shape only in the first years after World War I. These were ideas suggested by the Water Committee that was founded in Jaffa and that worked for two years, between 1919 and 1921. It was initiated by Meir Gurvitz, who was very active in spreading and promoting his Zionist sea vision. Gurvitz’s committee was the first body that attempted to offer a comprehensive Zionist plan regarding sea-based professions, with a view of consolidating an independent Zionist sea culture in the Land of Israel.

As the Jewish pre-state population developed, a new perspective took form, from the east, the Land of Israel, to the west, toward the sea. Those settling the land gradually viewed the coast with growing significance. It began to be seen as a place of recreation and relaxation, a symbol of vacation and leisure, as something that allowed an escape from routine and the daily hardships of life. In 1920, beaches in Tel Aviv started to become a central element in the city’s geography in terms of popular culture.

As an interface between the land and the sea, nature and culture, the beach was increasingly seen as a place of leisure and fun, holiday and entertainment.

“There is no Land of Israel without the sea of Israel,” proclaimed David Ben Gurion. In 1920, the sea increasingly came into focus and became a center for Zionist activity. In 1924, a process began to turn the sea into an official Zionist priority and the peak of this process occurred in 1930.

In 1924, a group of American Jews founded the America-Palestine Lanes Company, which purchased a ship that sailed to Haifa in 1925 with the Zionist flag hoisted alongside the American flag. That same year, the first Hebrew Sea Scouts group was founded. In 1928, the national Histadrut trade union set up sea-based sport associations. Their actions were copied by the General Zionist party. Their goal was to attract Jewish youth.

---

4 Cohen-Hattab. 2014, p.49
5 Cohen-Hattab. 2014, p.51
6 Cohen-Hattab. 2014, p.52
7 Azaryahu. 2008, p.255
The fact that three voluntary associations like this were set up within four years showed a growing lure among Zionist youth to the sea and to boating.

In 1934, the revisionist Betar youth movement set up a maritime school in Italy, which was designed to train Jewish sailors. The school was shut in 1938 when the Italian government rescinded its support. The idea of the sea being a trade opportunity was evident in a series of initiatives to set up Jewish-owned dock work and fishing companies. The appearance of the sea as a Zionist priority reflected the understanding that the sea is not merely a geographical element, but rather, an opportunity for trade, and a symbol of potential geopolitical challenges.8

An examination of the development of the relationship between Zionism and the sea in the area of the Land of Israel and toward varied sea-based professions shows that only from the 1930s onward did an institutional, significant change occur in the attitude of the leadership toward the sea.

This change was reflected in several practical actions, which are visible in a number of prominent milestones: the decision by the nineteenth Zionist Congress in 1935 to create a sea division dedicated to fishing and to the sea in the context of the Jewish Agency; the setting up of a Tel Aviv port in 1936, the first Hebrew port in response to the Arab boycott of Jewish activity at Jaffa port at the start of the period of unrest; the setting up of the Maritime Region of Israel, which was the first association for maritime training and the deepening of sea-based knowledge that was founded in that same year; the setting up of the Zim national shipping company at the end of World War II; the struggle to facilitate illegal Jewish immigration to the Land of Israel via the sea, which turned into one of the prominent features of the Jewish population's resistance to the British immigration policy.9

The founders of the pre-state settlement took the importance of the sea into account in varied ways. Meir Dizengoff, the first mayor of Tel Aviv, focused on the importance of the sea and port for Tel Aviv. Itamar Ben Avi, one of the first Hebrew-language journalists and the son of Eliezer Ben Yehuda (who played a key role in the revival of Hebrew as a modern language), emphasized the sea's geopolitical importance in the setting up of a future Jewish state.

David Ben Gurion presented the wider picture. He said that "conquering the sea" was not just a geopolitical necessity, but an aspect of the Zionist revolution that sought to reshape Jewish existence. His vision tied the sea to a process of emancipation. From his

8 Azaryahu. 2008, p.257
9 Cohen-Hattab. 2014, p.53
perspective, the difficult conditions of the Diaspora meant that Jews were disconnected from the land and the water, and that "conquering the sea" was the first, and vital, stage in a process of national revival. He said:

Conquest of the land by the urban people was a big adventure, the first of our movement, it was our work in the land. The second adventure, which is also great, and perhaps greater than the first, still awaits us – conquest of the sea. … without the sea, there is no access, no place … the Mediterranean is the natural bridge that links our small country with the wider world. The sea is an organic, economic, and political part of our country. And it is still wondering around freely. The power that pushed us from the city to the country is pushing us now from the land to the sea. … the path to the sea is the path to expand our country, to expand our economic basis, to expand our national health, to enforce our political stance, to take control of the elements. The sea opens up horizons and borders for us … we must remember: The land integrates ground and water.10

Another way of perceiving the idea of the "conquest of the sea" can be found in the statements of the revisionist movement. An idea of conquering the sea can be found in a booklet called "Betar's Path," which was published by the movement in October 1945. It called for all activities to be directed to a single goal: Jewish immigration to the Land of Israel. According to their claims, at that time, the conquest of the sea was more important than ever.

Avraham Blum11 stated that Betar understood that "[in] a land blessed with such a long coastline, the men of the land must know it. To know it means learning how, and in what way, when necessary, it can be conquered." The movement proceeded along this basis. At the initiative of revisionist leader Ze'ev Jabotinsky, the first Hebrew maritime school was founded. "The three main goals that can be acquired through maritime training are: (A) Training the Hebrew youths of the Land of Israel to sea-linked professions, (B) Promoting the idea of 'conquest of the land' throughout Jewish society in general and among youths in the diaspora specifically, (C) Encouraging initiatives from Jewish wealth owners to invest funds in the purchasing of maritime equipment, and the founding of Hebrew maritime factories in the Land of Israel."12

One hundred and twenty sailors, maritime engineers, and fishermen graduated from this school, and it had a decisive impact on Hebrew seamanship. It is worth noting that at that

10 Azaryahu. 2008, p.259
11 Blum. 1945, p.19
12 Markovitzky. 2004, p.488
time there were individual Jews who receive maritime training abroad. For example, Vice Admiral (Ret.) Shlomo Erell attended the maritime school in Civitavecchia, Italy, and later became Israel's Navy chief.

According to Avraham Blum, in 1945, there was a need to create maritime cadres, companies of people whose role was to act at the right time to realize the idea of building the nation.

The creation of the "Hebrew Sea" in Israel prior to the establishment of the state was based on the convergence of popular needs, trade interests, geopolitical fears, and strategic considerations. The "Hebrew Sea" was also about reconnecting to Jewish history.

With the founding of the state, one can see an attempt to develop the Israeli maritime vision as it was expressed in Ben Gurion's words: "There is one other territory that will play a big role in security, in immigration, and settling of the land, and this territory is bigger even than the Negev, bigger than the whole of the Land of Israel – it is the sea. This is one of the most important parts of the Land of Israel, of the Jewish state. There is no 'ours' and 'not ours' there, and even according to terms used by the Jewish National Fund people, there is no need to purchase land registries. Only two things are needed: Boats and seafarers."

In the nineteenth century, the founding father of maritime strategy, Alfred Thayer Mahan, argued that "the Mediterranean has fulfilled throughout world history a bigger role – from both a military and trade perspective – compared to any other similarly sized body of water. Nation after nation has tried to control it, and the struggle is still at its peak."

While these comments were written in the nineteenth century, this idea about the Mediterranean existed before and it continues to this day.

In conclusion, an examination of the importance of the maritime domain in the Land of Israel throughout history shows that it has been important in a wide range of areas; from the economic through to leisure, and strategy.

From the days of the Second Temple and the Roman occupation, the importance of the maritime arena in Israel has been visible in the perception of various strategies. Hence, although the State of Israel's history goes back only to the day of its founding in 1948,

13 Blum. 1945, p.19
14 Azaryahu. 2008. p.265
15 A section of a speech by Ben Gurion delivered on 6 February 1948, Ben-Tsur, 2007, p.1
16 Mahan. 1985, p.68
there are deep historical roots that link the importance of the sea to this geographical region. In addition, one can see that the founding fathers of the state appreciated the importance of the maritime arena. They gave it a central place in their thinking and reflected the vitality of the sea. Israel's thinkers and philosophers also had their views on the maritime arena. Therefore, the time has come to develop this vision in a defined manner and to create a model for an Israeli maritime strategy for modern times.

**Bibliography**


A General Grand Strategy and Maritime Strategy

Background

A country with a "grand strategy" means that it acts using a wide variety of national power options, to shape events in the world, and it attempts to reach specific national security objectives. A grand strategy provides the affiliation among the national objectives, and presents a plan that enables the desired vision to be realized. Strategies –maritime or others – are simple instruments that include various means: diplomatic, scientific, military, or economic. A strategy is merely a conceptual structure of actions that we believe in, because they will lead us to our desired interests.\(^{17}\)

Grand strategies are effective for delivering an objective and unifying direction for national leaders, public policy makers, allies, and civilians with an ability to influence and promote shared interests.\(^{18}\) Some of the most important and difficult decisions that political and military leaders must deal with involve grand strategies. These decisions are important because often, they have a deep influence on long-term security and on the economic vitality of the nation. In addition, they are usually tied in to a long-term investment of political and economic resources.\(^{19}\)

The Development of the Term "Grand Strategy"

In his early writings, Sun Tzu, the military strategist, discussed the art of military affairs, particularly focusing on military tactics and strategy. He did not distinguish between strategy and grand strategy. More than two thousand years later, one of the most famous and influential military theoreticians, Carl Von Clausewitz, wrote that "tactics teach how to make use of armed force" in strategy, the use is clear and concise, though a little sterile.\(^{20}\)

Clausewitz limits his definition to military forces and functions, but opens the door to considerations that are not military or political in the study of strategy. In his research on the topic of strategy, Sir Basil Liddell Hart magnified and assessed the significance of grand strategy. He argued that the role of a grand strategy is to coordinate all of the nation's resources, or the resources of a group of nations, to obtain the political objective of war.

---

17 Layton. 2013, p.64
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Hart added that, while war is on the horizon of strategy, a grand strategy has influence beyond war; it affects the resulting peace and on the extent of security and prosperity. Hart understood that the type of strategy that a nation adopts will have significant influence on securing peace, but he describes grand strategy as a political object of war. War is not an element of a grand strategy.\textsuperscript{21}

On the other hand, Paul Kennedy, a historian at Yale University who specializes in the history of international power, economic power, and grand strategy, took a somewhat different approach. Kennedy determined that the principle of a grand strategy is concealed in policy. In other words, grand strategy is found in the ability of national leaders to bring together all of the elements – military and non-military – and to safeguard and improve the state over the long-term.

According to Kennedy, a grand strategy is tied to bringing together all of the components, in peace and in war, in the pursuit of the nation's benefit. But Kennedy seemed to have reversed course when it came to distinguishing between a strategy of war and peace and a grand strategy.\textsuperscript{22} Kennedy's definition missed the key points needed to distinguish between a grand strategy and any other kind of strategy.\textsuperscript{23}

Former Senator Gary Hart described a grand strategy as a request for power and resources in order to realize great national goals. His idea of a grand strategy is one in which a coherent framework exists, providing a goal and a target, in which random events and not so random events can be interpreted and given significance, and responses can then be produced accordingly.\textsuperscript{24}

According to J.A. Bassani, a grand strategy, unlike a military or economic strategy, is long-term and wide in scope. It provides a broad spectrum for all elements of national power, in order to realize a more secure, prosperous future for the people.

A successful grand strategy must meet the following criteria: (1) it must be vague enough to allow for wide-ranging interpretation, (2) it must be a known asset, (3) most importantly, a successful grand strategy must improve the long-term welfare of the nation that it serves.\textsuperscript{25}
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As these examples show, the conventional understanding of a grand strategy developed over many centuries, grew out of frameworks, utilized a correct application of military force during war, reached national goals, and integrated all of the tools of national power, used during both peace and war.\textsuperscript{26}

**A Grand Maritime Strategy**

A grand maritime strategy includes: political aspects; defense and security of international shipping at sea; fishing; the safeguarding and use, regulation, and defense of exclusive economic maritime zones; coastal defenses; border defenses; protection of islands; and the participation of regional and international organizations.

**Development of the Term "Maritime Strategy"**

History has much to say about maritime strategy; the study of history certainly widens perspectives and allows us to obtain a deeper understanding of the reasons that led us to become who we are.\textsuperscript{27}

From the end of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, the most influential maritime theorists dealt mainly with the study of naval force as a component in maritime strategy. Most of them dealt with it in a military sense. Two prominent schools feature in the development of maritime strategy: the Blue-Water School and the Continental School.

**The Blue-Water School**

Here, one can find those who regard the fathers of maritime strategy to be the historian of the British navy, Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan (1840–1914), and the theorist Sir Julian Corbett (1854–1922). Both greatly influenced the development of modern maritime strategy and maritime build-up.\textsuperscript{28}

**Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan**: Mahan was active in the nineteenth century and was the first to develop a philosophy of maritime power. It received the approval of fleet commanders, and influenced the ambitions and policies of entire nations. His contribution was in suggesting a completely new formula of maritime strategy, and developing a critical analysis on the accepted tactics of naval combat. He was the first to distinguish between a strategy of sea combat and its tactics. Mahan's doctrine is based on an assumption
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that everyone needs sea lanes to maintain mutual ties and to trade goods, and therefore, he who controls the sea holds the power.\textsuperscript{29}

Mahan formulated six fundamental conditions for maritime power:

1. Geographic situation
2. Physical data
3. Area of control; in the context of sea power: the length of the coast
4. Size of the population
5. National character
6. Character of the government and the nature of national institutions\textsuperscript{30}

According to Mahan, the goal of a maritime strategy is to consolidate, both in peacetime and in war, power at sea, to assist it, and amplify it. He argued for a system of support points in the country itself and outside of it, for securing transport between them, and for building relations between fleets. All are components in the maritime strategy and the general military situation. The objective is to control the sea, because the enemy’s fleet is the main target for attack.\textsuperscript{31}

He claimed that the history of sea power is not in any way limited to war. There was an understanding that trading at sea has a deep influence on the power and wealth of nations. Yet wars that raged for other reasons eventually affected the right to control the sea in a tangible way.\textsuperscript{32}

Mahan also wrote that the accepted definitions for the term “strategy” limits it to military ruses that encompass one or another field of operations and/or can be totally separate from one another or mutually dependent. They are always seen as wartime events that occur in actuality or which will happen soon. According to Mahan, this definition is too narrow when dealing with maritime strategy. He quotes general Antoine-Henri Jomini in saying that a maritime strategy is different in that it is needed as much in peacetime as it is in war. A strategy of this kind creates benefits from every opportunity and secures any point on the coast, thereby turning a temporary conquest into a permanent one, wrote Mahan.\textsuperscript{33}
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If we briefly summarize the term “maritime strategy” according to Mahan, we could argue that the central term in his understanding is within the military context. He wrote that the history of power at sea encompasses all that can turn a nation into a great sea power, or history related to the sea is principally a military history.\textsuperscript{34}

Mahan looked at maritime strategy as a source of power and control in the international system – he who controls the sea has the greatest power. However, Mahan was criticized for being an unsystematic thinker. He failed, for example, to take into account factors such as social and cultural conditions in the rise of a sea power.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{Sir Julian Corbett}: Corbett was the first maritime theorist who seriously thought about a naval strategy's direct contribution to war on land. In his study on maritime strategy, Corbett distinguished between what he called a "general strategy" (or "grand strategy") and a "limited strategy."

General strategy dealt with the needs of war, including international relations and economic function. On the other hand, a limited strategy dealt with the details involved in managing the war. In addition, he distinguished between a maritime strategy and the actions of the navy. In Corbett's view, the principal concern of a maritime strategy is to set the reciprocal relations of the army and fleet in a war plan. Corbett argued that a naval strategy is only the part that sets the movement of the navy, whereas a maritime strategy sets out the role the navy must play in relation to the activities of the ground forces.

Corbett insisted that the goal of naval combat must always be to retain command over the sea, which, in his view, meant controlling the international trading lanes for commercial or military purposes. This constitutes maritime influence.\textsuperscript{36}

Command of the sea is achieved by defending against enemy invasion, attack and defense of sea trade, and cooperation with the military. Corbett put the navy in the central role of establishing command of the sea.

According to Corbett, command of the sea does not mean conquering the territory like it does on land. In essence, his interpretation is that one has the ability to move at sea unhindered, or without significant resistance, and at the same time, to prevent the enemy from doing the same. In other words, one has the ability to obtain a command of the sea.
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and to consolidate control in the naval arena, in which a state conducts combat during wartime, or which the state secures during peacetime and periods of calm.

He wrote that it would be a mistake to believe that if one side loses command of the sea, then it would automatically fall into the hands of the other side. In his view, the most common situation of war at sea is when no side has full command and control of the sea.\(^{37}\)

**The Continental School**

The principal representatives of the Continental School were Admiral Raoul Castex (1878–1968) and Admiral Wolfgang Wegener (1875–1956). Castex's ideas of maritime strategy were wider and more universal, and his thinking was more systematic and deep than Wegener's.\(^{38}\)

**Admiral Raoul Castex:** Castex borrowed Mahan's historical technique about the centrality of sea power and the supremacy of battle ships. At the same time, unlike Mahan, his work focused on strategy as a whole, not just maritime strategy. Only many years later, after his work was complete, did French sailors understand the true value and importance of his strategic idea.

In Castex's view, a wide-ranging strategy unites the activities of armies and navies every time the two types of forces must work together. He argued that a strategy like war is an art, not a science.\(^{39}\)

Like Mahan and Corbett before him, Castex believed that the main goal of a maritime strategy is to obtain or at least share control of the sea. Controlling international trading lanes is one of the most important elements, since it provides the ability to defend the coastline. In addition, Castex identified the great economic importance of acquiring control of international trade to facilitate the ongoing function of the nation's trade activities and industries.\(^{40}\)

In his view, the strategic command of one side over the sea often necessitates a decision to attack or even conquer an enemy coast. Castex also argued that the mistake in creating a separate naval doctrine is based on the belief that a navy's existence is sufficient to create deterrence, and that it will necessarily silence the enemy. He may have been the first theorist to believe in the possibility of using planes against the enemy's sea trade and exports.

\(^{37}\) Milan. 2009, p.7  
\(^{38}\) Milan. 2009, p.9  
\(^{39}\) Milan. 2009, p.9  
\(^{40}\) Milan. 2009, p.10
Unlike Mahan, but similar to Corbett, Castex fully believed in the need to create close cooperation between the navy and army – all must be subordinate to the army, since its success is a reflection of the success of the general strategy.

His main contribution to maritime theory was his insistence on the need to use fundamental terms for maritime strategy. These fundamentals must be transparent and flexible; otherwise they will not hold up in the face of changing conditions. In addition, he believed that a maritime strategy must recognize historical principles.\textsuperscript{41}

\textbf{Admiral Wolfgang Wegener:} Wegener was the most important twentieth-century interwar German maritime strategist. He fully believed that Germany’s policy of building a large navy without the promise of free access to the open waters of the Atlantic Ocean was a useless endeavor. Wegener was influenced by Von Clausewitz. His ideas therefore have much intellectual depth, more so than his many critics concede.

Wegener emphasized that a sea battle is significant to war only if it removes obstacles blocking one side from reaching its strategic goal. He explained that war at sea is composed of a ceremonial and a strategic component. The ceremonial component is action, while the strategic component is the effect.

If the strategic goal is faulty, the battle stops being a means and turns into an end goal in itself. Wegener argued that a maritime strategy is needed when there is a sea battle – it is supposed to reach a target of some kind, and not be a goal in and of itself. In his view, a maritime strategy is tied to the formation of the coastline; in other words, geography is important in the development of a maritime strategy.

According to his argument, the main purpose of the controlling power with a strategic stance is to realize its command of the sea, in other words, control of the trade routes. Wegener wrote that the maritime action plan is dependent only on a strategic location and not on the relative points of strength of the navy. Irrespective of mutual power, strategic location, and action plans, the ultimate goal of a strategic sea attack is to obtain equality in geographic positions.\textsuperscript{42}

Wegener was a controversial figure in the interwar period. He was intensely criticized by many admirals for his views on Germany’s maritime strategy. At the same time, his ideas won the approval of two generations of academic maritime students in Germany. His thinking is less significant than that of his predecessors presented here, but his
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importance lies in the fact that he emphasized the need to hold a geostrategic position that is comfortable for creating a successful maritime strategy.\textsuperscript{43}

The classical thinkers dealt mainly with the need to stress the role and importance of naval force for the rise and prosperity of sea countries. Another aspect of their research was maritime strategy. In addition, they were very attentive to maritime tactics and to the main tools for obtaining command of the sea and safeguarding it. The two schools both stressed strategy in the military sense.

\textit{The Blue-Water School}

stressed maritime strategy and argued that strategy is either offensive, as a decisive technique in the gaining of command of the sea, or it has a mutual dependence and a need for close cooperation between the navy and army.

\textit{The Continental School}

was more focused on the need to have command of the sea and ways to obtain it. They considered maritime strategy to be an integral part of what is today called a national strategy. Each thinker described and analyzed many aspects of war at sea that correctly belong to the operational art field. Together, their theories provide an abundance of information and knowledge regarding the different aspects of maritime combat.\textsuperscript{44}

\textbf{Defining a Maritime Strategy}

Despite the contradictions between past and present, one can find wide-ranging characteristics, and from those, it is possible to form a wide-ranging understanding of maritime strategy using the historical examples from which strategy is derived. National history and experience in maritime strategy can help identify ongoing national interests and priorities.

But a single maritime strategy cannot be sustained for a long period of time due to the fact that changes occur to the structure of relations and because of international changes that occur in the roles taken by specific nations in this structure. As a result, to understand the full range of problems within a maritime strategy, the historical experience of a person must form an addition to the understanding of the experience of other nations, in various periods of times and in different situations.\textsuperscript{45} A maritime strategy will change depending on the context, structure, national goals, technological elements,
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and available equipment. The abstract understanding of maritime strategy would also change.

During World War I or II, and other examples that can be given, it is possible to claim that the history of the twentieth century clearly shows there is no single maritime strategy that is relevant for all situations.

When we examine the strategy in history, particularly in the twentieth century, we must be aware of these changes, and know that the theory of maritime strategy began changing over time, even if players in history may or may not have been aware of these changes.46

As we can learn from the historical review of how the term “maritime strategy” crystallized, when the theorists spoke of maritime strategy in the past, the meaning was couched in military terms, and a desire to exercise force and obtain power. The sea was an additional means to reach these goals, whether through military or economic force. As Mahan argued: He who rules the sea possesses the greatest power.

In the twentieth century, a maritime strategy and border doctrine developed, and understandings became more wide ranging. Today, there is a greater theoretical understanding that builds, expands, and changes these ideas for strategic war. New technology, new situations, and new experiences have sparked an additional development of theory. These perspectives have expanded the fundamentals of the modern doctrine for maritime strategies.47

Over the course of the past hundred years, a maritime strategy appeared to become a secondary part of a wider strategy, since it touches on a whole range of activities and issues at sea. John B. Hattendorf stated that "a successful grand strategy assumes at its core a set of fundamental principles that supply the intellectual framework for its development and application. These principles are down-to-earth, unique, and stem from elements of geography, natural resources, political institutions, demographic aspects, and historical precedent."48

In its broadest definition, the direction of a maritime strategy is determined through the use of means, via various methods, to obtain objectives and particularly national objectives. Under these terms, maritime strategy is the direction of all of the aspects of national power that relate to the interests of the nation at sea.
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The navy serves this purpose, but a maritime strategy is not purely about the safeguarding of the sea. It is tied into additional functions of the state's power. These functions include: diplomacy; establishing and maintaining the security of the trading fleet at sea; fishing, exploitation, safeguarding, regulation, and the defense of an exclusive economic zone at sea; coastal defenses, the security of national borders, protection of distant islands, and addressing regional concerns around the world tied to the use of the oceans, the skies over the ocean, and what lies on the ocean floors.49

Today, we see a trend among various strategies around the world, starting from the main European states like the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, and through to the United States, China, Korea, and India, which have changed their perception in the understanding of maritime strategy. Maritime strategy is much more than having a navy. At the same time, navies are clearly an inseparable aspect of the maritime world. On the one hand, the navy is attached to a broad array of activities on behalf of national security. On the other hand, it is tied to the full spectrum of civilian activities in relation to the sea. A maritime strategy is the overall direction of all of the aspects of national power to achieve political objectives at sea. In maritime strategies that have developed over the past decade, the value of the navy is important, but the trend is moving toward integrating wider fields than merely the will to obtain power. There is a new emphasis on internal populations, and international cooperation. In the basic understanding of maritime strategy in general terms, there are no unequivocal statements, only theory, which is developing all the time.50
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Types of Strategies

According to Layton,51 while there are set characteristics in a grand strategy as a form of strategy, there is also a range of grand strategies.

It is important to note that every kind of grand strategy has an impact on the structure of the subordinate maritime strategy. The kind of strategy is dependent on the nature of the challenge faced.

A simple approach includes two options: The environment shapes the entire world order in a certain manner; or decision makers set the local grand strategy in states or regions.

Most of the grand strategies are local, even though decision makers examine the systemic environment when they shape a grand strategy.

There are three types of grand strategy: Denial, Engagement, and Reform.

Denial Grand Strategy

This entails power relations. A strategy like this glorifies military and economic power. It is a zero-sum game to stop others from doing what they intend to do. A denial strategy usually includes two topics: Access Denial and Area Denial. A denial grand strategy assumes that a large scale and more significant power is what defines results. In this form of a grand strategy, one becomes stronger by building military and economic power, or by transferring risks to a stronger country, so that one does not become the element that loses power. The problem with alliances is that it is not possible to know whether an ally seeks to only maximize its advantages.

In a denial grand strategy it is possible to create three alternatives for a world order: a unipolar world in which a ruling hegemon exists in the system and can ignore the other players; a bipolar world in which, to prevent stronger players from taking over weaker players, the latter increase their relative power by joining a stronger bloc, thereby creating a world made up of a balance of powers; a third option is setting up a combination of forces. This type of strategy defines the use, or threat of use, of force and war as a political tool to stop others.

Due to its forceful nature, the denial strategy does not usually lead to fixed, stable solutions, but leaves an arena that invites continued maneuvers of force. The denial maritime strategy finds expression when one uses denial of the opponent’s freedom of operations in the sea arena, sometimes through the setting of borders and restrictions,
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the creation of an infrastructure such as islands, and changing the sea arena through the use of force. A strategy of denial is activated independently vis-à-vis one or more opponents.

Engagement Grand Strategy

This is a strategy of cooperation with other players to achieve objectives and interests. It is an absolute power game in which, even if others have more power, this will not be perceived as a threat so long as the national objectives of the other have not been harmed. In an engagement grand strategy, war is not a regular tool of policy in the system of alliances, but a last resort, an admittance of failure, and an effective disbanding of the alliance. This type of alliance is shaped in favor of the players that are dealing with an external challenge or a strong external opponent, who threatens the joint interests of the allies.

In addition, when one of the members of the alliance is clearly stronger than the others, it is possible that an influence will be felt on the level of the reform strategy that influences the identity and norms of the weaker players. This kind of strategy can create three types of world order: (1) Reciprocal complex dependency, (2) Institutional order – creating joint institutions that enable cooperation between countries, and (3) Liberal order – very close cooperation between countries with agreed-upon principles and with strong economic ties. A grand engagement policy can have long-term influence.

An engagement grand maritime strategy is expressed when, on the tactical level, control of the local sea for short periods of time is attainable, but control of the sea on the strategic level involves cooperation with others for the benefit of all. The sea belongs to all. Control cannot be obtained alone while completely ignoring all other players. The involvement of others naturally increases the independence to act and maneuver. Safeguarding an engagement strategy requires the creation of an ongoing commitment that ensures that the common objective will suit the desirable interests of the players who partake in the alliance. These include groups of different types, such as countries, institutions, international bodies, and in addition to these, non-state actors like businesses or civilian sector organizations.

Reform Grand Strategy

This involves changing the ideas that others have and attaining state objectives and interests in this way. It requires an ability to influence the ideas of players or opponents, to the point where new ideas are adopted, and a new line of thinking takes root. If the influence is not sufficiently deep and powerful, old ways could return. A reform grand
strategy could influence two elements in the system: the identity of the player or the norms. This means identifying the way in which someone perceives themselves and others, which norms define types of activities that are acceptable, which activities can be undertaken, and what the limits are to the activation of force and the taking of various types of action. A strategy of this kind reshapes the principles that guide societies to act in favor of the player's interests, and can create a fixed change, though this can take a prolonged period of time. In this strategy, war is a conscience choice, and the benefit is judged only according to the question of whether the war helped attain the goal of reform.

A grand maritime strategy of reform can find expression when a foreign force is authorized to intervene on a distant coast and to work with different forms of national power in order to change the "collective spirit" on certain issues belonging to another society, thereby attempting to create a theoretical change in favor of the interest of the state that possesses this strategy.
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An Analysis of Maritime Strategies around the World

The Maritime Strategy of the United States

A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Sea Power

The document that lays out the United States' maritime strategy first clearly discerns that a grand maritime strategy is more than what is known as a naval strategy. A grand maritime strategy includes all of the government bodies that have responsibility regarding the sea arena, according to the US document, including not only the Navy but also the Coast Guard, law enforcement agencies, sea-based agencies, etc.

The US maritime strategy, which was published in March 2015, begins with a statement that says that since the first years of independence, the founding fathers recognized that the United States is a sea nation and recognized the importance of sea forces.

According to this document, maritime security is best achieved by integrating defense-related activities, private and public, on a global scale, as part of an effort that provides a solution to all maritime threats. The United States' maritime strategy lines up with all of the government's national security plans, and initiates a national, formulated, encompassing effort between the state, public sector bodies, and private sector bodies.

According to the document, in today's dynamic environment, when global maritime trade is expanding, populations are growing, competition for energy and natural resources is growing, and advanced military technology is advancing and multiplying on the sea and along the coasts, there is a need to organize a grand maritime strategy, now more than in the past.

In the US maritime strategy, the existence of sea power is the key aspect, and the critical basis for national power, prosperity, and international prestige. The maritime strategy that the Americans formulated and published shows how to design, organize, and utilize sea services in support of a national security strategy. It also sets maritime priorities in an age of limited resources.

According to this document, advancing the presence of the fleet is vital for strengthening alliances and partnerships: The Navy will provide the secure environment necessary for an open economic system that is based on the free passage of goods. It will safeguard natural resources in the United States; will promote stability; and will provide deterrence against conflicts and responses to aggression.
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In this strategy, the various branches of state developed eight support plans to deal with specific threats and challenges from the maritime environment. While the plans deal with various aspects of maritime security, these are mutually linked to one another, and mutually reinforce one another.

**The eight support plans are:**

- National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness, DOD and DHS (October 2005)
- Global Maritime Intelligence Integration Plan, DOD and DHS (July 2005)
- Maritime Operational Threat Response Plan, DOD and DHS (October 2006)
- International Outreach and Coordination Strategy, State (November 2005)
- Maritime Infrastructure Recovery Plan, DHS (April 2006)
- Maritime Transportation System Security Recommendations, DHS (October 2005)
- Maritime Commerce Security Plan, DHS (October 2005)
- Domestic Outreach Plan, DHS (October 2005)

**The Maritime Strategy of China**

*From "Five Dragons" to "Two Dragons"*

Throughout history, Chinese strategy has been focused mostly on China's land borders, on creating strategic depth by converging inwards and using its large land masses. During the end of the last century and the start of the current century, China became more open and turned into a large exporter.

China has now significantly expanded its scope of sea trade. This obligated the Chinese government to develop a new and creative line of thinking, and to create a new strategic depth, which pushes threats away from population centers and from the new centers of gravity that took shape along the coastline. In recent years, the People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN) expanded its activities in terms of frequency, length, complexity, and distance from land.

China is the first country to station a permanent flotilla in the Indian Ocean, as well as continuously hold maritime exercises and operations beyond the first chain of islands.53

At the Eighteenth National Congress of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), General Secretary Hu declared: “We must improve our ability to exploit resources at sea, to strengthen the maritime economy, to develop the maritime economy, to defend the

---
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maritime ecological environment, and, with determination, to defend China's sea rights and China's interests. We must build up China as a sea power."  

Defending the "far sea" enables China to respond quickly to rapid, sea-based challenges or threats in order to defend its economic interests, as well as deter potential rivals that are operating at sea from intervening in cases that are linked to China. China's principal interests of state security and economic stability were the driving forces behind the PLAN's missions.

The maritime security concern is homeland protection, which includes Taiwan, its territorial claim inside the Nine Line Dash in the South China Sea, and the islands in the East China Sea.

Threats to its security interests can stem from any military element that can prevent China from making its claims. China's maritime strategy must anticipate these threats, which could obligate the navy to take up a defensive position in a distant sea.

China's economic interests are global in scope, and they influence the way in which the state employs its navy. Piracy is a threat to China's economic interests, but the larger threat is to international Sea Lines of Communications (SLOCs), which cause delays to imports or exports.

Geography, as well as local threats to stability and the domestic political structure, are also influencing factors regarding China's maritime strategy. These factors shape China's maritime strategy and its assumptions about its strategic environment, influencing the way in which the sea should be utilized. Beijing could choose to use deterrence or dissuasion as strategic approaches for the new maritime strategy, and would include two sea components: the near sea and the far sea.  

**China's strategic goals are:**

- To secure and protect the homeland
- To safeguard the power of the Communist Party
- To be the decisive power in east Asia
- To be a world power
- To safeguard regional security
- To safeguard territory claimed by China

---
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• To safeguard the security of sea resources
• To secure Sea Lines of Communication
• To project power

The Maritime Strategy of the European Union

"Blue Growth" Strategy

"Blue Growth" is a long-term strategy to support sustainable growth in maritime branches as a whole. The seas and oceans are assets for the European economy, and there is a big potential for innovation and growth. This strategy is the maritime contribution to obtaining the objectives of Europe’s strategy for smart growth. The "blue" economy represents some 5.4 million jobs and creates a gross added value of almost $500 billion a year. At the same time, more growth is possible in a number of fields that are emphasized in the strategy.57

The European Union’s strategy58 places its main emphasis on the economic element. It argues that the sea and coastlines are a lever of the economy. Because their geography, coastal communities act as traditional centers for new ideas and for innovation. In addition to the traditional tendency toward innovation, three new factors have now entered the game. First, there has been rapid technological progress. Second, there is growing awareness that the sea floor and freshwater are limited assets. With oceans covering 71 percent of Earth, it must provide human needs like food and energy in a more sustainable manner. Meeting environmental targets can also be a source of innovation and growth. Third, the need to decrease greenhouse gases does not prevent the deployment of renewable energy installations beyond the coast. Rather, it provides an additional thrust toward energy savings, and this is another reason to prefer maritime transportation to land transportation.

There is significant potential for reducing maritime transport emissions, which make up 3 percent of all greenhouse emissions, by improving the energy efficiency of ships. This situation has created an opportunity for Blue Growth – an initiative to recruit the hidden potential of the oceans of Europe, the sea, and the coasts, for local jobs and growth.

The European Union’s strategy promotes a combined maritime strategy, together with a process that will firmly place the blue economy on the agenda of member states, regions, businesses, and civil society. It describes how member states and the EU’s policies are already supporting the blue economy and identifies specific areas where a
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pinpoint action can provide an additional stimulation. The action plan aspires to improve the maritime economy in the Atlantic Ocean, through the joint work of the EU's member states in the Atlantic region, and in the areas of the European Commission.

They present four priorities for study and investment in the advancement of a "blue economy," while safeguarding environmental and ecological strength:

1. To promote initiatives and innovation
2. To secure and improve the coastal maritime environment
3. To improve accesses and inter-connectivity
4. To create a sustainable model of cooperation from a social perspective of area development

This strategy emphasizes five areas in which an additional effort at the EU level could act as a catalyst for long term job growth in the blue market in line with the European strategy for 2020.

*The areas of focus of "Blue Growth" are:*

- Blue energy
- Maritime agriculture
- Maritime tourism, sailing, shores
- Mineral maritime assets
- Blue biotechnology

**The Maritime Strategy of Portugal**

*National OCEAN Strategy 2013–2020*

The strategic maritime vision of Portugal begins with the statement that the Portuguese sea is a national objective and that the potential of this arena will be structured according to economic and social perspectives with regard for the environmental values of the ocean and coastal areas, and it notes that all this is for the prosperity of Portuguese citizens.

Portugal's maritime strategy 2013–2020 is guided by the vision of the European Commission for the naval sector – Blue Growth. This new paradigm seeks to identify and provide solutions for economic, environmental, and social challenges through the development of a combination of affiliated policies. In this spirit, Portugal takes into
account and researches the interaction between a variety of activities and their influence on the maritime environment, maritime habitats, and biological diversity.

This strategy seeks to develop across sectors. At its core, the strategy is based on knowledge and innovation that will suit all uses of the sea and sea-linked activities, and it will be an effective and wide-scale promotion directing the correct usage of resources.

The “Blue Growth” strategy seeks to identify and support activity with a potential for long-term growth, to eliminate administrative obstacles that make development difficult, to promote investment in research, and to develop skill through education and professional training. The goals are to increase market competitiveness and create growth in the employment of qualified personnel, as well as strengthen social cohesion.

The primary missions of the Portuguese strategy are to place a high priority on maritime economy objectives and to create and maintain an environment that encourages public and private investment for the development of various activities linked to the ocean.

The Portuguese strategy argues that in order to reach success under a development model, the decision-making and management processes must be shared between the republic’s government and the local government of the islands, regions, and municipalities.

The Portuguese maritime strategy (MPP) combines all actors and development areas. The aim is that in the first, short-term stage, vital conditions will be created for reaching Portugal’s strategic maritime potential and for defining its national maritime identity. At a later stage, the aim is to realize this full potential.

**The goals of the Portuguese maritime strategy are:**

- To restore the national maritime identity in a modern and initiated context
- To present the economic, geostrategic, and geopolitical potential of the national maritime territory – turning the Portuguese sea into an asset with economic, social, and environmental incentives
- To create conditions for attracting investment, both national and international, in all economic ocean sectors – promoting growth and employment in the ocean sector
- To strengthen national scientific and technological ability, which serves the development of a new sector of activity that promotes knowledge of the ocean, and doing this efficiently, over time, to improve the resources and services of the ecological system
- To place Portugal alongside global leaders as a sea nation and a permanent fixture of the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) and the maritime strategy of the EU
The Maritime Strategy of Quebec, Canada

*The Maritime Strategy by the Year 2030; 2015–2020 Action Plan*\(^6\)

The maritime strategy of Quebec is the first in the history of Quebec, Canada. The plan seeks to cultivate sustainable growth in Quebec's maritime market and to encourage the creation of quality jobs all across Quebec. It also seeks to protect its ecological systems while improving conditions for communities in its maritime territory. This maritime strategy depends on a long-term view that reflects the results of broad consultation, held among partners in Quebec's maritime area. It also depends on a number of government divisions and bodies in Quebec. The government adopted three strategic directions for defining its preferred objectives.

**Development of a sea economy**

The maritime strategy seeks to promote direct job creation and public and private investment. To that end, the Quebec government will strive to create business opportunities that are attached to the sea economy. Through its initiatives, the government plans to have a decisive role in advancing investment opportunities for businesses that will produce jobs and economic growth in a sustainable way. The government adopted ten strategic priorities:

- Invest in infrastructure
- Develop coordination and logistics
- Develop port industrial zones
- Support ship building yards
- Develop short-range sea cargo transport
- Develop and renew sea tourism
- Modernize to ensure the long-term survival of the fishing industry and maritime agriculture
- Develop skilled work
- Develop knowledge in the maritime sector
- Promot Quebec's sea industries internationally

**Protection of the ecological system**

The proposed systems will influence the quality and sustainability of sea resources and will ensure the health of the population.

---

\(^6\) *The Maritime Strategy by the Year 2030, 2015–2020 Action Plan*
Improving the lives of Quebec's residents

To reach this objective, the Quebec government will ensure an economic "spin-off" from the maritime strategy that will help create jobs all across Quebec. In addition, steps will be taken to ensure that the maritime strategy will improve the quality of life of communities by creating a business climate that will contribute to the promotion of economic stimulus and the appearance of new businesses that create jobs.

The National Strategy of the United Kingdom

The UK National Strategy for Maritime Security

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is an island nation with a strong maritime legacy and sea interests located around the world. Its strategy argues that almost all aspects of national life depend on links with the outside world, and that most of these ties have been obtained by the sea. Britons depend on the sea for prosperity and security, and they depend on a stable global market for raw material, energy, and critical goods to safeguard its standard of living.

The UK sees "maritime security" as a tool to promote and defend the UK’s national interests, at home and abroad, by actively managing risks and opportunities from the sea sector in order to strengthen and promote prosperity, security, and the UK’s fortitude, and to help shape a stable world.

The UK’s maritime strategy focuses on five maritime security objectives:

1. Advancing an international secure maritime zone, upholding international maritime norms
2. Developing a governmental ability in the maritime sector and a policy capability in areas that hold maritime strategic importance
3. Defending the UK, its citizens and economy
4. Ensuring the security of transport lanes, vital maritime trade that exists in the UK’s maritime division, on both the regional and international levels
5. Protecting the resources of the UK’s population in territories abroad from illegal and dangerous activity, including organized crime and terrorism

The two main principles that the UK’s strategy adopted in order to guide its efforts are integration and cooperation: integration of the instruments of government and initiating efficient cooperation; and cooperation on a global scale with allies and partners, including

other governments, industry leaders, and the public. These principles of integration and cooperation will be the basis of the five core missions in maritime security.

These five missions represent the strategic path of the British approach – to understand, influence, prevent, defend, and respond.

- Understanding of the maritime domain – gathering intelligence, sharing knowledge, building partnerships, analyzing data, and identifying concerns
- Influence takes a number of forms, from diplomacy to law enforcement, and including economic activity and military involvement. The objective is to assist in reaching targets by convincing allies to lend their support or deterring opponents from acting against the UK’s interests
- Prevention takes the form of precautionary measures, in other words, being able to secure unstable areas, but prevention can also be an active response
- Defense is protecting interests set by actions taken to minimize harm to sea shipment and maritime infrastructure, as well as efforts to increase durability in case of attack
- Response could take the form of law enforcement or preventive action, or in the most extreme cases, use of military force

The UK’s maritime strategy argues that efficient maritime security activities require clear and stable decision-making in the government. This strategy sets a more holistic approach to maritime security, and it includes bringing together government activities under a single government structure.

The Maritime Strategy of Cornwall, Britain

A Future for Maritime Cornwall: The Cornwall Maritime Strategy 2012–2030

Cornwall is a maritime region. The culture and legacy of this area have been influenced to a great extent by their proximity to the sea. The Cornwall Council recognizes the importance of the sea sector together with the maritime environment it supports.

Cornwall's sea vision

- A successful maritime environment that is known around the world as an excellent place for work, leisure, and wildlife
- The economy is supported by a wide range of sea industries, transportation, and businesses, including environmental technology
- A rich maritime legacy, healthy environment, and natural sea scenery
- The community is open to change

This vision rests on seven intersecting issues, each one objectively supported, and each aspires to help supply an overall maritime vision for Cornwall:

1. A sustainable approach
2. An approach based on cooperation
3. Encouraging business and maritime innovation
4. Healthy, flexible sea communities
5. Work in the peninsula
6. Connecting land and sea
7. Pride, recognition, and responsibility for natural and historic cultural assets

Cornwall Council adopted this maritime strategy to guide the development policies and plans throughout its work with other interested organizations and the community.

Figure 1 shows the components of Cornwall’s maritime strategy:

Although Cornwall is a region on the British Isles and not a state in its own right, we looked at it to try to understand, in an in-depth manner, the idea of a maritime cluster, as well as the idea of creating two maritime clusters in Israel.

The Maritime Strategy of Singapore

The Singapore Maritime Story

The maritime strategy of Singapore seeks to turn the country into a central economic player in the maritime domain. The approach is based on the idea that Singapore is facing competitive pressure from other ambitious maritime centers, and hence, it needs to constantly improve its business offers or face an indirect risk in this market.

The Minister Mentor of Singapore Lee Kuan Yew described his country as being the first exit point of Asia, adding that it is continuing to invest in new facilities and infrastructure for the future. To compete effectively, he said, Singapore needs a maritime cluster that is filled by adding core groups to it, for instance, ship owners and operators and maritime support services such as maritime funds, insurance, and legal services.64

The maritime strategy of Singapore65

Singapore’s success in the maritime branch can be attributed to the influence of the following clusters, which have been integrated successfully in its core maritime activities.

Four core challenges that stand in the way of Singapore's maritime industry:

1. Responding to external changes, which can be divided into four categories:
   ◊ Environmental challenges
   ◊ Security challenges – To deal with the security threats posed by piracy and organized crime, Singapore enlarged the depth of international cooperation via various international and regional forums
   ◊ Competition – Maintaining ongoing innovation in order to respond to the threat of a rise in competition in the area; meeting challenges that the periphery poses; expanding new markets
   ◊ Lack of confidence in maritime industry through the fundamentals of sturdy financial management – Enlarging government monitoring of corporations in order to ensure the confidence of investors and preventing instances of fraud and other offenses.

2. Innovating in the field of technology – As stated by the CEO of the Maritime and Port Authority, Tay Lim Heng: Remaining at the forefront of technology is an integral part of making Singapore an international maritime center.

64 Richardson. 2008, pp.10–13
65 Salim. 2010
3. Bringing forward the chain of value – In order to build a maritime industry that competes by providing unique added value, the industry must move along the chain of value, to develop new capabilities and take advantage of new opportunities.

4. Developing human resources

The Maritime Strategy of France

*Blue Book: A National Strategy for the Sea and Oceans*\(^{66}\)

Although France is not historically a sea-faring country, its assets are not at all ordinary. France faces big challenges, and can no longer neglect opportunities or ignore the responsibility that its location bestows on it. "We require a clear, rational, and ambitious maritime policy."

In examining the content of this policy, the French strategy presents a restoration of the importance of the sea and its influence on the lives of those who live on land. This is done to underline the challenges, and assets that justify France's role as a sea nation.

The French argue that affiliated or territorial policy must only be based on one component within a full whole, and cannot be planned in isolation. Every decision-making process must therefore be weighed according to all of its components, and the long-term implications of the decisions that are taken must be imagined, whether they are environmental, economic, or social.

The French chose a three-part model: geographic division, topical division, and broadside topical division. Tools were added to this, such as knowledge, surveillance, intelligence, analysis, evaluation, funding, and resources. All of this was done in a government-supervised procedure. See figure 2.

According to the French maritime strategy, the maritime policy of France, which was prepared by the minister for sea quality, must be a combined policy that is designed for sustainable development. The strategy must "necessarily be consistent in dealing with the sea and the coast. In addition, it must be well coordinated with international action."

In this combined policy, decisions necessarily involve a large number of interested actors: representatives of the central and local governments, civil society, voluntary groups, and experts.

To achieve legitimate targets, an integrated maritime strategy must come up with a working technique on every affiliated and territorial process. The strategy will unify the

---

\(^{66}\) Blue Book: A National Strategy for the Sea and Oceans. 2009
various targets, which are set by the government and local authorities, at all levels of policy shaping, application, and evaluation.

The French strategy argues that objectives should be structured for every interested actor. This will influence conflict and competition. This combined policy will include, if necessary, strategic planning of all uses of the domain and of resources.

![Figure 2](image)

**Four preferences for the French maritime policy:**

- To invest in the future – To be oriented toward an environmentally friendly future
- To sustain economic development of the sea – To be a source of added value and employment, particularly for the coastal population
- To promote the maritime domain of territories
- To declare France’s place in the international arena

**The Maritime Strategy of the Netherlands**

*The Dutch Maritime Strategy 2015–2025*  

The document containing the Netherlands’ maritime strategy was jointly published by the Ministries of Infrastructure, Environmental Protection, Economy, Defense, Education, Culture and Science, Finance, Foreign Affairs, and Social Welfare and Employment. The

---

68 *The Dutch Maritime Strategy 2015–2025*
Dutch maritime strategy speaks of integral cooperation between the government and a maritime cluster.

The foundation of the Dutch maritime strategy is the existence of a maritime cluster. There are economic relations and spatial relations between members of the cluster, and hence, they enjoy cooperation. The Dutch maritime cluster brings together representatives from ports, sea facilities, shipbuilding yards, dock work centers, maritime equipment, manufacturing, drilling, and others. It benefits from good cooperation among the various research centers, as well as international cooperation.

The knowledge in this cluster includes the influence of innovation in the job market. Thus, for example, the maritime dock work industry was an element that catalyzed innovation and the development of knowledge in other industries. The cooperation required by the Dutch maritime strategy leads to the development of industry and the market.

According to the Dutch document, the cluster as a whole is bigger than the sum of its parts. This is a stable branch, is wealthy, and is of high quality, and hence it becomes a forward-driving force that leads to a prosperous future. The root of this cluster can be found in the heart of society, and it leads to the development of cooperation. The Dutch say this strategy represents their thinking when it comes to innovation, a courageous spirit, and entrepreneurship.

**Key points of the Dutch maritime strategy:**

- Human assets
- Innovation
- Trade
- Accessibility
- Environmental safety and protection
- Security and stability

**Insights from World Models**

As we have seen, the models in place in various countries have been selected to suit the unique situations in every country or region. What stands out is the United States’ emphasis on security, which receives a lot of weight, and is also a central component of the United Kingdom’s global strategies. Security receives less weight in other states that are under NATO coverage, or smaller states in which the economic issue is significantly bigger. The economic aspect forms the main component in national security in countries such as Singapore.
In addition, one can clearly see that defining clear national targets and interests is the basis for maritime strategy. Countries have defined a vision for the maritime domain and interests according to which they choose their strategy and the way to realize it. Maintaining a strategy, a planning methodology, and its realization are also dependent on the character of each country, its culture, and the scope and character of the players who engage the maritime domain.

When the dominant fundamental pillar is the economic side, as we have seeing in the EU, we certainly see a methodology of engagement and the creation of maritime clusters that band together all of the players tied into the maritime domain into a single body that creates knowledge, cooperation, and a lobbying force, and encourages the building of business and other ties to better realize the strategy and policy that are set. On the other hand, when the dominant basis is the security component, such as in the United States, the government takes the lead together with government ministries and central institutions to consolidate an ability to defend and respond across the various sectors of the sea.

In China's case, the cultural political structure creates a character in which the government clearly leads and makes use of military capability and the building of infrastructure on a global level to consolidate a mainly economic strategy.

Israel is unique and combines a prominent security need with variable threats in the regional sector on the one hand, and on the other, it contends with an economic need that requires a global perspective due to the country being an economic island in a landmass that is blocked, leaving the sea as the main economic opening.

A connection between the fields necessitates regional and global cooperation vis-à-vis various players, and therefore the main strategy for Israel must be chosen accordingly. At the same time, there is a need to create internal cooperation in order to fully utilize the country's limited resources. To that end, a connection is needed between the various players, through the creation of a maritime cluster. This will be expanded upon in the next chapter.

One can see that most European countries have some sort of maritime strategy in place, based on the idea of a maritime cluster, even if not all have an official policy document.

An organization exists in Europe called the European Network of Maritime Clusters, which has the following member states: Germany, Bulgaria, Denmark, Greece, France, Belgium, Norway, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Iceland, Poland, Portugal, Spain,
Sweden, Holland, and Britain. Every state under this umbrella organization develops its own strategy tied to the idea of a maritime cluster.69

Table 1. Main points of world maritime strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of strategy</th>
<th>Year of publication of maritime strategy</th>
<th>Main players in building of strategy</th>
<th>Main points of strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| United States (US) | A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Sea Power | 2015 | Government bodies: Navy, Coast Guard, Law enforcement, Sea agencies and others | • Advancing naval forces  
• Strengthening alliances and partnerships  
• Advancing a necessary secure environment for an open economic system  
• Allowing free passage of goods  
• Safeguarding natural resources  
• Advancing stability |
| China | China does not have an official maritime strategy. At the same time, in its actions and declarations, it is possible to see that China is developing a strategic approach to the maritime domain | One example is China’s white paper from 2015 | The Communist Party of China | • To secure and protect the homeland  
• To safeguard the power of the Communist Party  
• To be the decisive power in east Asia  
• To be a world power  
• To safeguard regional security  
• To safeguard territory claimed by China  
• To safeguard the security of sea resources  
• To secure Sea Lines of Communication  
• To project power |
| European Union (EU) | Blue Growth Strategy | Starting in 2012, the approach continues | EU member states Economic bodies | • Blue energy  
• Maritime agriculture  
• Maritime tourism, coastal sailing  
• Sea mineral resource  
• Blue biotechnology |
| Portugal | National OCEAN Strategy 2013–2020 | 2013 | Based on the EU’s Blue Growth All players and development fields | • To restore the national maritime identity in a modern and initiated context.  
• To present the economic, geostrategic, and geopolitical potential of the national maritime territory – turning the Portuguese sea into an asset with economic, social, and environmental incentives  
• To create conditions for attracting investment, both national and international, in all economic ocean sectors – promoting growth and employment in the ocean sector  
• To create conditions for attracting investment, both national and international, in all economic ocean sectors – promoting growth and employment in the ocean sector  
• To strengthen national scientific and technological ability, which serves the development of a new sector of activity that promotes knowledge of the ocean, and doing this efficiently, over time, to improve the resources and services of the ecological system  
• To place Portugal alongside global leaders as a sea nation and a permanent fixture of the Integrated Maritime Policy (IMP) and the maritime strategy of the EU |

69 European Network of Maritime Clusters. Web: http://www.cnmc.eu/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of strategy</th>
<th>Year of publication of maritime strategy</th>
<th>Main players in building of strategy</th>
<th>Main points of strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quebec, Canada</td>
<td>The Maritime Strategy by the Year 2030; 2015–2020 Action Plan</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>• Investing in infrastructure&lt;br&gt;• Developing coordination and logistics&lt;br&gt;• Developing port industrial zones&lt;br&gt;• Supporting ship building yards&lt;br&gt;• Developing short-range sea cargo transport&lt;br&gt;• Developing and renewing sea tourism&lt;br&gt;• Modernizing to ensure the long-term survival of the fishing industry and maritime agriculture&lt;br&gt;• Developing skilled work&lt;br&gt;• Developing knowledge in the maritime sector&lt;br&gt;• Promoting Quebec’s sea industries internationally&lt;br&gt;• Improving the quality of life for Quebec residents&lt;br&gt;• Defending the ecological system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom of Britain and Northern Ireland (UK)</td>
<td>The UK National Strategy for Maritime Security</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td>• Promoting a secure maritime domain, maintaining international maritime norms&lt;br&gt;• Developing government abilities in the maritime sector&lt;br&gt;• Defending the UK, its citizens, and economy&lt;br&gt;• Ensuring the security of vital shipping, trade, and energy lanes that are located in Britain's maritime division, at the regional and international levels&lt;br&gt;• Defending the resources of British citizens abroad against illegal and dangerous activity, including organized crime and terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall, Britain</td>
<td>A Future for Maritime Cornwall: The Cornwall Maritime Strategy 2012–2030</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cornwall Council Maritime sector Maritime environment</td>
<td>• Safeguarding the maritime environment known around the world as an excellent place for work, leisure, and wildlife&lt;br&gt;• Safeguarding the economy that is supported by a large variety of maritime industries, transportation, and businesses, including environmental technologies&lt;br&gt;• Safeguarding the correct maritime legacy, environment, and natural sea scenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>The Singapore Maritime Story</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>• Environmental challenges&lt;br&gt;• Security challenges&lt;br&gt;• Enlarging the scope and depth of international cooperation&lt;br&gt;• Competition – maintaining ongoing innovation&lt;br&gt;• Enlarging government supervision of corporations&lt;br&gt;• Technological innovation&lt;br&gt;• Advancing the value of value – Industry must move along the value chain to develop new abilities and take advantage of new opportunities&lt;br&gt;• Developing human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name of strategy</td>
<td>Year of publication of maritime strategy</td>
<td>Main players in building of strategy</td>
<td>Main points of strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>Blue Book: A National Strategy for the Sea and Oceans</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Central government</td>
<td>• To invest in the future – To be oriented toward an environmentally friendly future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>• To sustain economic development of the sea – To be a source of added value and employment, particularly for the coastal population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interested economic-social players</td>
<td>• To promote the maritime domain of territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representatives of civil society</td>
<td>• To declare France's place in the international arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safety and the quality of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Ensuring Secure Seas: Indian Maritime Security Strategy</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td>• Safeguarding India’s maritime interests in areas where these remain relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Adopting innovation, creating a credible combat force, in order to complete missions across the wide spectrum of naval activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Modernizing infrastructure and efficient logistical management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing effective leadership, developing and maintaining high motivation and skilled professional personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>National Maritime Security Strategy</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Government National security council Underwater security council Crisis council</td>
<td>• Sanctioned by national legislation and international law in Spanish sovereign waters, respecting international regulations in the open sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Protecting human life at sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safeguarding freedom and security to navigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Safeguarding maritime shipping trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Securing the shipping industry and other maritime industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Securing ships sailing under the Spanish flag (trade, fishing, and leisure vessels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Securing embarkation and maritime infrastructure, including off-shore facilities, oil pipelines, underwater pipes and cables, divers, and critical infrastructure on the coastline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserving sea assets (living and non-living)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserving the maritime environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserving the underwater archaeological legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name of strategy</td>
<td>Year of publication of maritime strategy</td>
<td>Main players in building of strategy</td>
<td>Main points of strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>No official international document Stratfor published a geopolitical analysis that shows the main points of Seoul's maritime strategy</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Government Navy</td>
<td>• Desire to act beyond its coastal immediate waters, independently of the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Desire to consolidate its position in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Autonomous navy to defend trade interests abroad, security closer to home, and protection of its territorial sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Competitive economic player and political cooperation with Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Flow of resources and raw materials from other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Defense against North Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian Maritime Doctrine</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Security forces</td>
<td>• Human element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Physical environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Geographic strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Social perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• National security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Maritime Cluster – Strengthening Maritime Awareness and Cooperation

Background

States that border coastlines have large-scale economic activity that is tied to maritime trade, ports, fishing, vacationing, water production, gas resources, energy, and more. Due to the multiplicity of players and interested parties in the maritime domain, a new awareness has been generated on all matters tied to the usage of the sea, which necessitates a blueprint for activities and cooperation between the various fields.

This maximizes the profit from exploitation of the sea and prevents damages that result from potential clashes between the various users. It includes a systematic, ecological approach for sustainable development, based on a combined approach.

The need to coordinate between varied fields of activities at sea and on the coasts has led to a large number of states concluding that there is a need to set up what is termed "maritime clusters."

What Is a Cluster

A cluster is defined by Professor Michael Porter as a group of geographically adjacent members that share institutions linked to a certain field. The driving force inside the cluster is to create external economic relations, or economic and financial relations between the players inside the sector, a shared technological knowledge base, and a common working market.70

When we discuss a maritime cluster, we are describing a set of players, various bodies whose common denominator is the sea. Yet there is variety among the players, which is expressed in their approaches to: economic weight; various branches or centralization; affiliation between industry, research, and policy; global, national, and regional engagement, etc.71 The players in the cluster compete in certain areas and cooperate in others.

Goal of the Cluster

The goal of the maritime cluster is to synchronize activities and influence policies in order to maximize profits for a variety of branches that deal with the maritime domain. A

70 European Commission. 2008, p.5
71 Engelke. 2009, p.7
cluster like this can promote solutions and technological innovation, while also creating business cooperation inside the cluster and overlapping industry outside the cluster.

There is no set definition of a maritime cluster, though there are criteria and indicators, which include quantitative elements such as economic growth rates; employment rates; the size of the cluster; large, small, or medium-sized companies, etc. In addition to these, there are qualitative elements such as confidence and cooperation; general influence on the economy; links to other players, such as other members; research infrastructure; or policy makers/governments.\textsuperscript{72}

**Advantages of the Cluster**

Within the scientific community, there is, more or less, a consensus regarding the advantages of using the cluster approach and a general belief that clusters ultimately lead to greater economic prosperity. There is no doubt that the maritime domain requires a vision based on a full global perspective, which is created interactively, via a search for strategic solutions for efficient use and increased added value, and produced by exploiting the sea's resources.

A maritime cluster will help to achieve a better expression of these and will maximize cooperation among various elements. It will also contribute to the building of a full display of the maritime domain, including its resources, and various linked activities.\textsuperscript{73}

**Main Components of the Cluster**

1. Common field. A cluster is traditionally perceived as an area of expertise from the perspective of the players who take part in it, and who are linked to one another through a core activity.

2. Concentration of as many players as possible. Players can be defined as companies, maritime associations, businesses, professional maritime associations, energy businesses, fishing parties, and a wide range of others, all of whom have a common denominator – the maritime arena.

3. Links and reciprocal relations among actors. The dynamics in this cluster are between competition and cooperation, in line with the market's characteristics. Players can try to obtain an advantage by decreasing costs or prices, raising quality, recruiting new clients, or through entry to new markets. At the same time, the players in the cluster could cooperate around core activities, or through the abilities of each that complete

\textsuperscript{72} Engelke. 2009, p.8

\textsuperscript{73} Monteiro, de Noronha, Neto. 2013, p.4078
one another. Through simultaneous activation, they can draw on resources and services that would otherwise not be at their disposal had they operated in isolation.

4. Critical mass. The more players, the more durable the cluster. It increases its ability to withstand external shocks or other forms of pressure, including the loss of members, even those that are considered key members, so long as the critical level of members remain.

5. Innovation. In a wide-ranging sense of technical, trade, and/or organizational change integration.\(^74\)

Not all of these components must be present at the same time in a certain cluster, but all are positive contributors to the fortitude and competitive ability of a successful maritime cluster.

**Characteristics of a Maritime Cluster**

The evolution of a maritime cluster stems from deterministic forces such as legacy, culture, history, and the availability of specific natural resources and initiated forces. These forces include decreasing the costs of a transaction, particularly regarding access and the transfer of knowledge; an advantage in size and scope; a common area of supply, wealth, or technological sources; access and cooperation to the market and technological change; activating more sophisticated learning and demand processes; and strengthening the leverage of public/private cooperation through centers of excellence.

Most of the initiatives of the cluster represent efforts to improve competitiveness within a certain field. This usually involves private businesses, public bodies, and/or academic institutions. To achieve this, satisfactory cooperation is required between the government, and sources of wealth, knowledge, and entrepreneurship to succeed in the international maritime market, which is becoming increasingly competitive.\(^75\)

A maritime cluster\(^76\) is a term that took root in Europe, and the policy of using clusters is gaining momentum.

The clusters contribute to higher standards for European maritime products and services, and a higher rate of integration of the maritime economy. They contribute to growth and economic employment, as well as the maintenance of an overall maritime economy. In addition, by integrating environmental aspects, they also help improve the quality of life.

---
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in coastal areas. Despite the wide range of activities and business interests held by the maritime industries and services, the knowledge and scope of activities is shared, and hence, links have been created by various players. Together, they seek to operate in a successful European cluster.\textsuperscript{77}

The scope of activities linked to the sea is expressed by figure 3 presented by the EU.\textsuperscript{78}

Maritime cluster organizations represent the full traditional maritime sector – sea trade, ship building, maritime equipment, maritime services, leisure and sailing, ports, supply, and sea facilities. In addition, the cluster relates to the sea's resources: fishing, natural assets (gas, oil), and tourism and leisure sites.

**Developing a Maritime Cluster – Access and Funding**

There are various approaches to organizational developments for maritime clusters on all matters relating to the initiative of setting up the cluster. Figure 4 covers the main

---
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characteristics of the organizations that initiate from top down, and for maritime groups that initiate from the bottom up.\textsuperscript{79}
The Netherlands was one of the first to develop a maritime cluster with government support. The Dutch maritime cluster brings together representatives from the ports, sea facilities, dock works, ship building, maritime equipment, manufacturing, and digging. The cluster also enjoys good cooperation with various research institutes.

In Denmark, clusters focus on setting a policy framework while setting quality as a prior condition. In addition, the maritime cluster in Denmark is focused on knowledge, with an emphasis on innovation in education.

In the United Kingdom, there are a few examples of national and regional initiatives. The UK strives to raise the profile of the sea, including the maritime sector, and has set a plan for cooperation across the entire field in the future. Britain encourages cooperation, which enables all of the sea’s users to make their voices heard, while safeguarding their communications with the local government and other maritime organizations.

In Schleswig-Holstein, Germany, industry, politics, and science have met in order to create a regional cluster that will serve as a “model maritime area.” This maritime cluster focuses on fostering ties inside the local maritime community, and with other partners, providing information and raising awareness about the cluster, as well as developing joint projects in the field, focusing on skills, cooperation, innovation, and all matters tied to the growing process of a company involvement in international markets.

The French have decided on two maritime clusters in different geographic areas to create economic competition – one is in the Mediterranean Sea and the second is in the Atlantic Ocean. The purpose of the French maritime clusters is to gather, spur, and advance the maritime economic branch. The clusters include more than 360 organizations from various sectors; large groups and companies, federations and professional associations, local government, research institutes, and the French navy.

As these examples illustrate, there are a variety of ways to create maritime clusters, and it is important to examine the advantages of each structure in order to find out what structure best suits Israel.

The Advantages of a Maritime Cluster

Clusters are especially important for encouraging additional bodies to grow. They are also important for creating interaction between the economic maritime activities and a wide range of services (which themselves can maintain a special relationship and

---
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associated other services, such as insurance or mediation), as well as relations between social partners who deal with the maritime arena.

Through their participation in the clusters, secondary contractors can also develop expertise that opens new opportunities for them. Through strategies of joint training and education, clusters can assist in strengthening the skills set and improve the attractiveness of professions tied to the sea. From this perspective, it is worth citing European social dialogue committees that already exist, which enable joint strategies to develop in the fields of construction and dock work, maritime shipment, transportation lanes, the fishing industry, hotels, and restaurants.

Maritime clusters support the arrival of sustainable solutions that are good for the environment, such as joint development and the use of high-quality fuels and renewable energy sources.82

Strong clusters sometimes give businesses access to assets that they could not otherwise allow themselves when acting alone, such as knowledge, export markets, distribution, or joint marketing, and the clusters can therefore especially assist small and medium-sized businesses.

Additionally, they can help enlarge the productivity of companies, to lead an increase in innovation, and encourage new links between various maritime fields. Centers of teaching and research, financial institutions, innovation in intellectual property, advisers, local and regional development agencies, and other support groups are key players that can maximize the business-creative potential of partners in a maritime cluster.83

European experience, and the arguments above, show the many advantages of setting up and consolidating a maritime cluster for the State of Israel.

Central Components for an Israeli Maritime Cluster

Natural Assets – Gas (Today) and Oil (Potentially in the Future) and Others

Recent discoveries of gas reserves in Israel's territorial waters are influencing its economy, both in the energy independence sense and the ability to use the gas as an export branch with geopolitical effects. The discovery of gas also has some influence on the ongoing sensitive security situation, which has now become even more sensitive.
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In addition, Israel has increased its rate of desalination of sea water, as a solution to water shortages, and decreased its dependence on sources of water that exist in the territories of other countries. It can certainly be concluded that the importance of the sea in Israeli policy has increased in recent years.

Israel and Lebanon are involved in a dispute over their land border, as well as a dispute over their maritime border following the discovery the gas. Tensions exist due to a legal battle over the rights to natural gas and oil reserves recently discovered in the Mediterranean Sea. Officially at war for years and without diplomatic relations, Israel and Lebanon have never agreed about how to define their borders.84

When Israel announced the discovery of gas in the "Tamar" and "Levyatan" fields, Lebanese officials claimed that both sites were located in a Lebanese economic zone, and that Israel is attempting to steal Lebanese resources. In response, official Israeli sources warned that any attempt by the Lebanese state or by Hezbollah to harm the offshore facilities will trigger a strong Israeli response.85

As of now, Hezbollah has placed its full weight against Israeli intentions to reach a compromise with Lebanon over a division of territory, in order to maintain another point of friction with Israel. It seems that Hezbollah is interested in adding the maritime economic borders issue to a list of demands, in the name of a future clash with Israel, just as it did with its claim to the Sheba Farms and the seven Lebanese villages that Israel holds, according to Hezbollah's claims.86

The importance of gas for sustainable economic development on behalf of the State of Israel is a given, both in the context of internal development, and in the context of trading a resource between various countries (as was the experience with Egypt). Maritime natural resources are an important economic source, yet one that creates tension with some of the neighboring states, which necessitates much consideration and a broad strategic response.

**Fishing and Maritime Agriculture**

An additional element tied to the Mediterranean that began to develop in recent years is the maritime agriculture field.

Maritime agriculture is a developing field in the world, with an annual rate of some 5%–10% following the dwindling of fishing stocks on the one hand, and on the other, a rise
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in seafood demands. Out of 100,000 tons per year of fish consumed in Israel, most fish consumption is supplied through imports, and only a quarter of this consumption is through local produce. Out of the total quantity of produce in Israel, some 2,500 tons of fish are raised in cages in the Mediterranean Sea. Increase in the production of maritime farming is important both in the national and the municipal perspectives. A gradual and intelligent development of this field will contribute to the development of the "blue economy," while safeguarding the principles of sustainable environmental, economic, and social development.\textsuperscript{87}

Israel has many important motives for developing maritime agriculture. These have led the Israeli government to decide approximately twenty years ago to divert resources in order to speed up the development of the industrialized fishing and maritime agriculture sectors. In addition, the decision is aimed at encouraging entrepreneurship for producing fish and seafood in sea- and land-based facilities, developing infrastructure, and increasing research and development in this area.

At the same time, despite the growing importance of utilizing the potential for maritime agriculture in Israel, until now there has been no defined overall policy, one that is organized and clear, for the sustainable development of the branch. Alongside the implications that stem from the lack of a development policy, there is the concern that the continued development of the field in Israel will run into growing difficulties in light of the multiplicity of initiatives and interests in the maritime arena.\textsuperscript{88}

An additional maritime area that is located on the border of the State of Israel is the Red Sea arena, which cannot be ignored as 25 percent of Israel's trade passes through it, and asymmetric combat processes are underway in the Bab El-Mandeb and Horn of Africa regions that lead to the Red Sea area.

Since the days of the Roman Empire, the Red Sea served as a central route for sea trade between Europe and south Asia. Today, a third of the sea traffic in the world passes through this body of water.\textsuperscript{89}

One can see the potential in the Red Sea, in relation to international cooperation (such as with China) and in terms of the economic importance of expanding trade in this area. In 2013, the Chinese authorities announced the maritime Silk Road initiative, with an emphasis on the importance of sea lanes and trading routes with Europe. This
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announcement came after a decade of setting up Chinese trading ports across the Indian Ocean and Arabian Sea.\textsuperscript{90}

In addition, against the background of the rise of piracy activity off the coast of Somalia, the Chinese navy has increased its interest in securing international trade routes in the Red Sea.\textsuperscript{91}

\textit{Maritime Foreign Trade}

It is worth noting the fact that Israel’s foreign trade occurs almost exclusively through the sea (99 percent). Seventy million tons of goods passed through Israeli ports in 2014. Israel operates five large exit points for shipments – four on the Mediterranean coastline and one from the city of Eilat on the Red Sea.

In 2014, these trade shipments dealt with 45 million tons of cargo. Israel has two main trade ports, Haifa and Ashdod, and also operates two energy ports, Hadera and Ashkelon, which together received 27 million tons of oil and coal in 2014. The Red Sea port is significantly smaller. It mainly enables the import of vehicles from Asia and the export of natural minerals.

The movement of cargo in 2014 totaled 2.3 million tons. At the same time, the distance between Israel and the principal maritime lanes, as well as its unique international diplomatic stance, prevents its ports from turning into more significant players in the regional competition.\textsuperscript{92}

Based on all of the above, it is clear that maritime transport to the ports of Haifa/Ashdod and Eilat is very important. The seas in which import-export shipping occur are long and narrow, bordered by hostile states, and substantial areas that are not under state control, but rather, home to hostile organizations. Securing maritime transportation is a clear economic need, despite its security significance.

\textbf{Summary}

All of the above, and other factors, form a strong catalyst for advancing an initiative for the setting up of a maritime cluster, which will deal in an integrative manner with all issues tied to the maritime domain, create a synergy vis-à-vis the authorities, and with them, promote a policy that supports and strengthens the exploitation of natural
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resources for the necessity of the Israeli economy and the welfare of its citizens, while creating a sustainable process for future generations.

A number of models exist, and, in general, they can be divided into two main types: a purely economic model and a model that integrates the economic and security elements in an adjusted, suitable calculation.

Israel has a clear security requirement to defend its maritime arena, stemming from various threats, but at the same time, it has widespread economic activities linked to maritime trade, ports, fishing, leisure, water production, gas and energy resources, and more. The scope of the Israeli maritime activity and the quantity of companies dealing with the range of issues of the maritime arena allows and certainly justifies the creation of an Israeli integrated and wide-scale maritime cluster.  

In addition, due to the existence of two seas on Israel's borders, it is possible to create two maritime clusters, one for each area, and to create a web of economic networks inside the State of Israel between these clusters, which have a common denominator of security.

An internal network such as this can, in the future, develop and become integrated into the European network of maritime clusters, and for creating wider links with the Far East.

An additional level of integration that Israel must examine is the level of government in such a maritime cluster. Does the cluster, in its first stages and during its founding stage, have to be led by the government, or can be an independent civilian initiative? This issue will be addressed after we clearly define the various partners, and it is possible that the path to a wider and more encompassing maritime cluster is through a phased process that begins with government leadership and develops into partnerships with civilian maritime companies in Israel.

The correct combination between security needs and the economic sphere, helped by the creation of a combined maritime cluster, will allow an open and synergistic dialogue that will make processes more efficient and place the maritime domain in the public discussion in a professional, open, and accessible manner. Doing so will consolidate joint thinking processes with policy makers, and serve as a significant element in creating a maritime strategy for Israel, which suits the twenty-first century.
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A Recommendation for a Model and Methodology for a Grand Maritime Strategy for Israel

Assessment

An analysis of the models in place around the world shows three types of grand strategies: prevention, engagement, and reform. Each suits a certain area and geopolitical situation, and a unique geopolitical environment.

Which model suits Israel given its unique circumstances and environment – between continents and seas – and in its politically unstable area and security-conscious situation?

Israel also grapples with questions about natural gas resources; a dwindling fishing area; an almost nonexistent Israeli commercial shipping fleet; an Exclusive Economic Zone area that requires defense and protection because it is in close proximity to conflict zone borders (Lebanon and Gaza); a crowded land area with critical infrastructure adjacent to the coast; and a high population concentration along the coastline and the results of this (see assessment 2017 of the Haifa Research Center for Maritime Strategy and Policy).

The State of Israel is considered a regional power, with a relatively big economy and military fortitude. At the same time, the threat level is high and constant, especially along the northern borders and in the Gaza region to the south.

Despite rocket fire and the threat of tunnels both in the north and south of Israel, Israel is experiencing continued economic growth and has maintained stability for a prolonged period, which is a testament to the public's ability to respond quickly and the institutional and regulatory steadfastness that creates a basis for continued development.

Israel has six ports; two are energy ports (Hadera, Ashkelon) and four are trade ports for the loading and unloading of ships (Haifa and the Kishon, Ashdod, and Eilat). In addition, Israel has marinas and fishing harbors along the coast. The proximity of the cities to the scope of activities is high, and there are relatively low traffic levels.

Israel's maritime domain includes sovereign waters (12 miles), adjacent waters up to 24 miles, and the economic waters, which are 70–100 miles from the coast and border on the economic waters of Egypt and Cyprus, in an area that includes 24 thousand square kilometers.

The scope of trade and sea-faring cargo is approximately 98 percent (in terms of volume) of the total trade with Israel, and has strategic importance for the state. Gas reserves discovered at sea are an important development that will influence Israel's energy dependence on external parties and on sea trade, but are still located inside a maritime domain that requires defense, as do Israel's shipping and trade lanes. It is worth remembering that on the seabed, additional critical infrastructure exists, such as international communications cables that link Israel to the rest of the world, and of course, the gas pipeline being placed there that will transfer gas to the rigs, and to land.

The Israeli commercial shipping fleet has been reduced over the years, to the point where there are just a few ships with gold currency belonging to the state company Zim, and this has an impact for times of emergency that require clarity and responsiveness. The amount of maritime personnel is also small, as is its experience and knowledge in the field. Israeli seamanship exists in the form of companies dealing with the commercial side, while leasing ships around the world without need for direct ownership or shouldering operating costs.

The threat of piracy in the Red Sea and near the Horn of Africa is a cause for difficulties and risks that also affects Israel's maritime trade, but the international forces conducting operations and existing defenses on trading ships contain the threat and ensure continued functionality. In other words, Israel has benefited from the international need to act against piracy.

The ongoing war in Syria and the international presence in the Mediterranean Sea is a security challenge that requires close cooperation between forces that operate in a relatively small area. Threats by Hezbollah and Hamas continue to be the main issue that threatens the economic waters and port areas and require an integrative response of simultaneous defensive and offensive capabilities.

From this point, Israel must choose a model for a grand maritime strategy that will respond to the range of interests and issues, with an emphasis on Israel's unique security situation in its current geostrategic and geopolitical environment and with an optimal forecast of future developments.

**The Security Component and the Naval Force Buildup**

The IDF's naval branch has been built over the years as a protective force against Arab navies and terrorist threats that attempt to infiltrate from the sea, or to strike at sea. The continuous security missions of the navy are intensive, and the navy is well built overall for its littoral missions.
Defense of the economic maritime waters during routine times requires an additional force build-up that will suit a large sea sector, and for creating a suitable response capability in line with needs. The Israel Navy has produced a doctrine and decided on a large-scale force build-up, on behalf of the mission to defend the economic waters and the associated high costs.

There are those who dispute whether this force build-up is necessary in light of the mission's characteristics, yet the Navy's surface fleet has significantly decreased over the past two years, from 25 ships to just 13.

The threat level posed by the Syrian Navy has decreased considerably, not because of its order of battle, which has not decreased, but rather, due to the low level of fitness and engagement with internal threats. The Egyptian Navy's vessels have become more powerful, quantitatively and qualitatively, and in some fields its capabilities surpass those of the Israeli Navy. But a peace treaty is in place, and there is certainly a reasonable ability to deal with an unexpected development from that direction as well.

There is a conceptual dispute regarding the need for larger vessels for economic waters and over the question of whether this force build-up is not, in fact, meant for a navy that undertakes broader activities.

It is important to stress that in light of the small force, vessels that are as versatile as possible are important. These are the kind of platforms that can conduct more than one mission and more than one type of mission, and which will enable a better use of the IDF’s and the Navy’s resources.

In addition, it is clear that when we examine the force buildup from a long-term perspective, vis-à-vis the dynamics in place in the Middle East, there is a need to adjust calculations to focus on the potential for creating new capabilities. The package sales of Magen Sa'ar 6 ships to the Navy were approved at all necessary levels, and it is a part of the naval force buildup for the coming years.

The submarine component in the security equation takes into account the strategic depth created by the maritime domain and responds to this in the form of six advanced Dolphin submarines and the safeguarding of a quantity of vessels that will allow full operational availability.

To that end, basic infrastructure is being built and long-term technological development is being pursued, operational doctrines are being created, and advanced activation abilities are being evaluated. The personnel needed to operate the submarines are continuously active and are a vital asset for conducting missions.
Meanwhile, there is growing need for personnel in the cyber sphere, and other intelligence areas, and these are competing with the Navy for a similar level of quality of personnel, albeit of the non-combat type.

In this case, the IDF must learn how to direct those who are trained for combat to operational units, and avoid defining rear roles as combat roles, such as cyber combat soldiers. The IDF should also avoid creating a lack of congruity between the actual role and the title of the role, or make it harder to fill operational units that require a high quality and suitable mental and physical fitness.

As a result, it is totally clear that the security component is the central and most important component in the model that Israel will choose. The challenge is the way the security component can be combined, based on an understanding that it will contribute to the economic prosperity for the benefit of Israel's residents, but will not be the principal component. In a state in which the news speaks, every hour, of serious security developments, it is difficult to accept that security is a critical but not exclusive aspect in the long-term vision.

**Choosing a Model for Israel**

An analysis of the environment and challenges that emerge in the annual assessment of the Haifa Center for Maritime Strategy and Policy for 2017 clearly shows that the scope of challenges requires a great deal of cooperation with regional countries and with influential powers in the region.

The United States reduced its presence in the Mediterranean following the initiative of President Obama, known as the "Pivot to East Asia." It is important to stress in talks with the new US administration that this policy should change.

At the same time, the United States continues to have interests in the Middle East. Russia is increasing its involvement in all matters that are linked to Syria. It is involved the internal war in Syria and Iraq against opposition groups and ISIS, together with Hezbollah, with Iranian support.

China is actively maintaining a strategy of prevention, and to a great extent it is taking over ports in the eastern Mediterranean Sea to consolidate and ensure continuous sea trade on behalf of the Chinese economy. China markets its products to the West, particularly to Europe and the United States.

Between all of these is Israel, located at an important geographic and geopolitical intersection.
From the vantage point of international relations and non-Israeli players, Israel should choose a strategy of engagement as a leading strategy, though in pinpoint events and specific issues, it has the power to operate in line with a strategy of prevention, for example, regarding Israel's maritime border with Lebanon or the sea sector in Gaza. But usually, the use of a strategy of prevention places Israel in the path of a political and sometimes legal and international dialogue that extracts a price and requires a response, and therefore, a cooperative approach is preferable, so long as national interests remain unharmed.

In addition to threats, it is important to stress opportunities that stem from inter-power cooperation, such as occurred in the disarmament of chemical materials in Syria, in which the United States, Russia, and other European countries took part.

Israel should know how to operate correctly in such situations, out of national long-term interests and a defined grand strategy. From a regional perspective vis-à-vis its sea neighbors, Israel has a variety of relationships. On the one hand, regarding Lebanon, Syria, and sectors in the Red Sea, we face a security threat, and, since this is a sea domain, distant threats can also approach us, such as the patrol by Iranian ships in the eastern Mediterranean on their way to visit Syria.

On the other hand, Israel enjoys close relations with Cyprus, China, European countries on the Mediterranean, and improving relations with Turkey. Israel lives in peace with Egypt and Jordan, and holds security coordination in the maritime domain. At the same time, there is no institutionalized or organized cooperation in the area that allows for the creation of a regional strategy in the eastern Mediterranean Sea, and it is difficult to expect one to take shape in the near future. As a result, Israel must choose a model of engagement strategy, out of a view of, and integration with, the global strategies of the United States, Europe, and China, and out of an ongoing examination of the influence of India and Russia. The strategy should be built in a way that will allow for future regional cooperation.

**A Methodology for Building a Grand Maritime Strategy for Israel**

The entire process is necessary for building three main channels that are integrated and mutually reinforcing: government leadership, a maritime cluster, and a research body.

The first channel is designed to lead the process at the government level, from top to bottom. In the current structure, it seems right for the National Security Council to lead the process.
Additional government ministries that must provide input are: The Ministries of Energy, Transport, Foreign Affairs, Environmental Protection, Agriculture (fishing and maritime agriculture), Tourism, Defense, Finance, and Strategic Affairs.

The second channel is designed to set up a maritime cluster as a government authority (see chapter on maritime clusters). In the context of this maritime cluster, a dialogue will be created, and the most updated assessment will be assembled on the maritime domain, and it will therefore be reasonable to expect a high level of maritime awareness that will enable information-based decision making, and an accumulation of professional, updated knowledge.

The third channel is designed to set up a supporting research body that deals with maritime strategy, which will accompany and provide academic research for all who engage with the issue. It is possible to select the Mediterranean Sea Research Center of Israel at Haifa University as the research body for this issue.

This methodology is required to enable Israel to define its grand maritime strategy, which will lead to economic welfare and growth for Israel, nourished by the maritime domain and all of its components.

Methodology for Maritime strategy

Figure 5

A model that takes the local arena into account, and tries to safeguard global and regional cooperation, necessitates a cooperative approach.
The required methodology to reach a high level of external cooperation vis-à-vis international elements is built on a number of stages:

1. Israel must define its interests for the maritime domain as an anchor for planning – every strategy depends on the infrastructure of national interests, and the country's target audiences. Without an orderly and agreed upon definition at the level of government regarding these interests, we will continue to maintain solutions to problems without direction and guidance. It is better to begin with the national general interests, but even in their absence (if there is no choice), it is right and necessary to define the interests in the maritime domain, and from there, to continue building a grand maritime strategy for Israel.

2. A sturdy internal infrastructure should be built, but only after gathering updated information and knowledge. Then it will be possible to deal with the range of internal needs and interests of every sector that touches upon the maritime domain. Furthermore, it will be possible to deal with conflicting interests, or those that make conditions difficult, such as the development of a port by China, during a time when there is an Israeli interest for the Americans to view Haifa Port as an American home port, which strengthens and tightens the United States’ ties and commitments to Israel. Or, for example, the tension that exists between the wish to develop islands into national infrastructure and the desire to maintain an open fishing area or large-scale maritime infrastructure. To that end, a need arises to set up a maritime cluster, which will assemble together all of the various interested parties and enable an open professional dialogue among the bodies and the government, to create an infrastructure of common and deep knowledge for taking decisions, and setting the priorities of the interests for the maritime domain.

3. There is a need to build an analytic system and long-term analytic tool, since the pace of change in the world is fast, and the maritime domain is also changing with relative speed. International law influences the ability of states to act to secure shipping lanes vis-à-vis piracy, and vis-à-vis maritime terrorism, and therefore there is a need to create an ability to have long-term influence from a legal perspective, and to be in partnership with the states of the world on this issue. In addition, technological development on all matters is gaining momentum, such as the navigation systems and automation of ships, advanced communication systems, cyber in the maritime domain, the structure of ports and pace of activity in them, local and global command and control systems (see the automatic identification system), etc. All of these are expected to influence the Israeli maritime arena in different ways, to the point of breaching the ability to realize the chosen strategy and achieve Israel’s interests. Therefore, a long-term forecast and analysis ability must exist for these and other fields that influence Israel's grand strategy, allowing for repairs in time, and to prevent
wasting future resources by choosing appropriate responses, to the extent that this is possible.

4. A need exists to direct resources and define priorities. After national interests are well defined for the maritime domain, information can be assembled and knowledge embedded, for the creation of a clear picture of challenges and priorities, including a long-range analysis on the basis of a professional forecast. Decisions can subsequently be taken regarding the allocation of needed resources for realizing the strategy.

5. Finally, a process for building organizational inter-ministerial processes needs to be developed, which will allow efficiency and an optimal utilization of processes. This allows for a supervised process of realizing the strategy, and ensuring that there is correct exploitation of the resources made available on the one hand, and on the other, it enables a process of ongoing updates in line with the information that continues to accumulate during the process.

6. An overall structure for such a strategy is offered in figure 6.
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The proposed structure is divided into three main parts:

1. A grand strategy and supporting strategies with an additional division according to topics:
   - Geographic – The strategic response must look at three different sectors that interface with one another in the maritime domain. The first is the global view and an examination of cooperation and points of possible friction vis-à-vis the
maritime strategies of countries in powers in our region. The second relates to a regional perspective of neighboring states, and creating cooperation or prevention in points where interests do not line up. Finally, there is a local internal perspective, in terms of taking advantage of Israel's location between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea, and between Israel's different ports, each one in its location, environment, and influence on the coastal region, and areas of potential islands, etc.

◊ Broadside issues – These secondary strategies influence previous divisions simultaneously. Central topics for this division are the security aspect for the maritime domain, regulation, regulations and guidelines, international law, the way in which these are interpreted, etc.

2. **Government mechanisms and managing processes** – This issue is a critical component in every methodology, as building a strategy of this type, with a multiplicity of interested parties, creates an obligation for an integrative process that requires determination and commitment at the phase of defining national interests for the maritime arena and continues to the buildup of knowledge and ongoing awareness, which allow for the setting of targets and the realization of a grand strategy.

3. **Broadside tools** – These include mechanisms for building up information on the maritime domain from research studies and gathering statistics on all topics tied to this area. In addition, tools are needed to gain a broad maritime awareness that allows for updates, and a rapid ability to deal with the processes or targets in any secondary strategy. An ability to forecast and analyze developments is required, which will allow for general updates to the grand strategy, together with optimal adjustments to the defined interests. Finally, resources need to be directed to the budget, and should be used to create a tool for supervision and results assessment.

The preferred model for a grand maritime strategy, therefore, is the engagement strategy model, with a methodology of international cooperation. This calls for the setting up of a maritime cluster in Israel under the leadership of the government and other bodies, which will provide the knowledge development components, and an increase in general awareness of all matters linked to the maritime domain.

**Summary**

Israel requires a grand maritime strategy that suits its unique needs and sensitive geostrategic and security situation in the Middle East. Israel's strategic location between continents and seas has created a special role for it in the history of world nations. Israel's place has not changed but the geostrategic environment has changed greatly over the years, and is now marked by instability in the states that surround Israel's
borders, with an emphasis on Syria and Lebanon, which are in internal wars, a prominent lack of rule in substantial areas, and a lack of clarity over the stability of Egypt and a high potential for instability in Jordan. All of these, together with the continuous friction with the Palestinians, with Iran and its nuclear program waiting in the background for the right moment to burst forward and realize its capability, obligate Israel to weigh its steps and act to strengthen Israeli national security and the economy. Israel's past conditions, and an analysis of future possible events, leaves no doubt that a grand maritime strategy obligates the engagement strategy approach.

This is the derivative of a national maritime vision, which will allow Israel to invest correctly in industries and in ties with bodies and states in the region and beyond it. By doing so, it will take advantage of its geographical location to improve its political geostrategic situation, while creating regional and international cooperation to strengthen economic fortitude and the ability to influence its distant future.

**Proposed components of a model for an Israeli maritime strategy:**

1. **Mediterranean and Red Sea** – two essential maritime sectors to Israel from the defense, economic, and geostrategic perspectives. The connection between them will place Israel as a bridge and link between the East, and the Mediterranean Sea and the West.

2. **Security and safeguarding agreements** – The power of the maritime force and its ability to project power is a necessary and broadside component, which mainly influences but is also influenced by components of a strategy for a grand policy. In addition, the legal issue and the authority and interpretation of international law forms a fundamental component in the ability to realize every maritime strategy.

3. **Natural resources and energy** – These are national assets for future generations that directly influence the quality of life in Israel and their level, and which require sound judgment in the ways these are exploited.

4. **Maritime infrastructure as an alternative to the land** – Israel has a limited land area, and therefore the maritime domain must be exploited for national infrastructure as much as this is possible.

5. **Changing geostrategic arena** – The maritime arena is changing and developing. Every strategy will have to be able to provide a decision making ability for suitable application in changing geostrategic conditions.
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6. **Innovation in the maritime arena** – The maritime arena is receiving growing importance in the world, which recognizes the many technological changes, and Israel has an opportunity for human, business, and technological growth.

**Recommendations**

Drawing up a national strategy is a complex matter, which demands professional and authoritative leadership by the government and the institutions responsible for the maritime sector. In order to build a strategy that is adjusted to these needs, there is a need to collect information and knowledge, to study, in an in-depth manner, the challenges of the maritime domain, and only after that, to set the strategy.

Collecting information and knowledge requires cooperation between many organizations that compose Israel's maritime cluster, and those of countries in its region. Setting up a maritime cluster as part of the process of building an infrastructure of maritime information is advisable.

This cluster must be set up (as in the case of Portugal) by a government or a party under it, and be a source of mutual influence on the institutions of the players in the cluster. It must be repeatedly nourished by the government and by the players, thereby creating an obligation for a joint process for managing strategy that is forward-looking in the maritime arena.

The University of Haifa's Center for Maritime Policy and Strategy forms a source of knowledge and an academic resource that can partner with institutions in Israel in the process of calculating and analyzing the possibilities, as well as managing the methodology for building the strategy, in line with the proposed model.

Israel must set out on this path now, because Israel could find itself without influence or an ability to utilize the maritime domain, in a way that can harm its future. States and powers around Israel are shaping strategies and realizing them and are not taking Israel's interests into account, and in fact may run contrary to Israel's best interests.
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