

## **JOINT STATEMENT TO HASC ON 2010 QDR**

Chairman Skelton, Representative McKeon, and members of the Committee. We appreciate the opportunity to discuss DoD's 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review. Over the last year, the Department has worked to develop a process and a final product that meets the high expectations of the leadership of both the Department and Congress. We have been ably assisted along the way by our many interactions with Committee members and staff, and we look forward to a continued strong partnership.

From the outset, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates took ownership of the QDR. Together with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen, the process benefitted from a close civilian-military partnership, and we believe the 2010 QDR has helped further rebalance and reform the Department in favor of prevailing in today's wars and preparing for a range of plausible future challenges.

There is no doubt that America remains a nation at war. The Secretary and the Chairman have together ensured that current conflicts are placed at the top of our policy, program, and budgeting priorities, ensuring that those fighting America's wars and their families—on the battlefield, in the hospital, or on the home front—receive the support they need and deserve. The QDR report reflects this unassailable priority.

### **Complex environment**

The QDR places our wartime priorities in a broad strategic context, arguing that the international system will continue to be reshaped by rising powers, the problems of proliferation, highly uneven rates of economic and social development, climate change, rising demand for resources, rapid urbanization, and other trends that can spark conflict or increase the frequency and severity of state failure. The speed of globalization continues to make it easier for a wider range of state and non-state actors to acquire sophisticated technology that in the last century would have been available to only a few.

These shifts in the strategic environment carry implications for how our armed forces will operate in the world. America's continued dominance in large-scale force-on-force warfare provides powerful incentives for adversaries to employ strategies and tactics designed to offset our strengths. In Afghanistan and Iraq, we have seen how the proliferation of technology has enabled smart adversaries to develop and employ effective methods to target U.S. and allied troops as well as the civilian population. More broadly, many future adversaries are likely to possess sophisticated capabilities designed to contest or deny command of the air, sea, space, and cyberspace.

Given this complex environment, both Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen feel strongly that the United States requires a broad portfolio of military capabilities with maximum

versatility across the broadest plausible spectrum of conflict. The QDR attempts to further institutionalize their shared vision.

## **Defense strategy**

The need to promote and defend America's interests in a complex world requires a defense strategy that conveys a clear sense of priority while being agile enough to evolve and adapt over time. The QDR advances a strategic framework and argues that the Department of Defense must balance resources and risk among four priority objectives:

First, **prevail in today's wars**. The point of departure for our strategy is the imperative to prevail in today's wars. In Afghanistan, this requires the additional troops the President has authorized—more than 50,000 since taking office—and a wide range of key enabling capabilities, including fixed and rotary-wing lift and unmanned aerial systems. In the war against Al Qaeda and its allies, this requires continued attention to quality and quantity of our special operations forces, the effectiveness of our international intelligence and military partnerships, and our global network of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities. As we continue the responsible drawdown of forces in Iraq, prevailing in this context requires further developing an approach to security assistance that better enables both U.S. military and civilian personnel to build security capacity, promote effective governance, and further place our strategic relationship with Iraq on a sustainable long-term trajectory.

Second, our defense strategy focuses on enhancing the ways in which U.S. forces help **prevent and deter conflict**. Doing so requires maintaining land, air, and naval forces capable of prevailing in limited and large-scale conflicts in anti-access environments. These forces must be enabled by space and cyberspace capabilities, and enhanced through ballistic missile defense and counter-WMD capabilities. America's deterrence also rests on a safe, secure, and effective nuclear arsenal. Credibly underwriting U.S. defense commitments requires tailored approaches to deterrence—approaches that integrate all elements of national power, rest on a network of strong regional alliances, and build new partnerships to address shared challenges.

Third, we must **prepare to defeat adversaries and succeed in a wide range of contingencies**. We've come to learn at great cost that America's current and future adversaries will not conform to conventional ways of war. If we are to truly prepare to defeat 21st century adversaries and meet other challenges, then we must include counter-WMD, support to humanitarian relief, counterinsurgency, stability, counterterrorism, and cyberspace operations more fully in our planning processes. And we must also recognize that future adversaries are likely to employ a mix of approaches and capabilities if and when they choose to oppose the United States, our allies, or our partners.

Fourth, we must **preserve and enhance America's all-volunteer force**—our most precious military resource. These long years of war have significantly strained our military personnel and their families. And while the morale and effectiveness of those in the field remains high, there are indicators that worry us—from post-traumatic stress, to

increased rates of divorce and suicide. For too long the health of the all-volunteer force has been an underemphasized priority in our defense planning. This QDR has striven to include the need to preserve and enhance the force as a core component of our policy, planning, and force management considerations. The Department's senior civilian and military leadership remain committed to being good stewards of the All-Volunteer Force.

Together these four priority objectives are at once timely and enduring. They capture the essence of what the Department must do to protect and advance American interests, and they constitute the key priorities that drive how we think about the overall size and shape of America's armed forces.

### **Rebalancing the force**

The QDR matched particular capability improvements to these objectives by evaluating alternative future forces against a diverse set of scenarios, which depicted a wide range of plausible challenges that might call for a response by U.S. military forces. The Department also assessed lessons learned from ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. Collectively, these assessments helped inform decisions affecting capabilities in six key mission areas:

- Defend the United States and support civil authorities at home;
- Succeed in counterinsurgency, stability, and counterterrorism operations;
- Build the security capacity of partner states;
- Deter and defeat aggression in anti-access environments;
- Prevent proliferation and counter weapons of mass destruction; and
- Operate effectively in cyberspace.

In each key mission area the QDR recommends capability-enhancements that are also detailed in the FY 2011 budget submission to Congress. The QDR report outlines most of the enhancements in detail, but in general the evolution directed under the QDR can be broadly characterized by the following trends:

- U.S. ground forces will remain capable of full-spectrum operations, with continued focus on capabilities to conduct effective and sustained counterinsurgency, stability, and counterterrorist operations alone and in concert with partners.
- U.S. naval forces will continue to be capable of robust forward presence and power projection operations, even as they add capabilities and capacity for working with a wide range of partner navies. The rapid growth in sea- and land-based ballistic missile defense capabilities will help meet the needs of combatant commanders as well as our key allies.
- U.S. air forces will become more survivable as large numbers of fifth-generation fighters join the force. Land-based and carrier-based aircraft will require greater average range, flexibility and versatility in order to deter and defeat adversaries that are fielding more potent anti-access capabilities. We will also enhance our air forces' contributions to security force assistance operations by fielding more aircraft that are well suited to training and advising partner air forces.

- We will continue to increase the capacity of special operations forces and will enhance their capabilities through the growth of organic enablers and key support assets in the general purpose forces.
- The capabilities, flexibility, and robustness of U.S. forces across the board will be improved by fielding more and better enabling systems, including ISR, electronic attack, communications networks, more resilient base infrastructure, and enhanced cyber defenses.

### **Strengthening our relationships**

Ongoing operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere fundamentally depend on substantial and sustained contributions both from a range of traditional treaty allies with whom we share long histories of common courage and sacrifice, but also with new partners with whom we share common interests and a desire for regional security.

America must increasingly integrate its efforts with others to help protect shared interests and promote prosperity and security. The QDR argues that we need to focus more on crafting an approach to our regional defense postures that emphasizes tailoring our mix of forward stationed and routinely deployed personnel and capabilities to be responsive to the unique regional security environment. Such efforts include improving resiliency in our base infrastructure, pursuing more opportunities for joint and combined training, and crafting ways to further support multilateral efforts to assure access to the global commons.

The QDR also acknowledges the need to increase interagency cooperation in our contingency planning and operations. In this regard, the QDR continues the Department's advocacy for improved expeditionary civilian capacity and greater cooperation in all facets of national security planning.

### **Taking Care of Our People**

The QDR advocates important initiatives for improving the health of the force. These initiatives will enhance warrior and survivor care and provide a single electronic medical record for our service members throughout their lives. The QDR reinforces the urgency to increase research and treatment for a broad range of injuries, especially the signature wounds of Post Traumatic Stress and Traumatic Brain Injuries. Increased rates of combat stress, substance abuse and suicide, point to a force that is under a high degree of pressure from repeated long deployments and limited time at home.

Reducing deployment time and increasing time at home, as appropriate for each component, are important for reintegrating our service members returning from a combat environment to routine activities at home. Though the force has remained incredibly resilient over the course of eight years of war, we must prioritize programs that sustain resiliency of service members and their families such as: child care facilities, quality education for children, 24/7 family support assistance, outreach to Guard and Reserve members and their families, and referrals for non-medical counseling. By emphasizing

the emotional, social, spiritual and family aspects of fitness, these health-of-the-force investments will pay dividends in national security today and well into the future.

### **Reforming How We Do Business**

The QDR explores in detail several critical institutional issues that the Department's leadership have identified as priorities—reforming security assistance, institutionalizing our rapid acquisition capability, strengthening the industrial base, reforming the U.S. export control system, and crafting a more strategic approach to climate and energy issues.

The attention paid to these issues in the QDR reflects the Department's deepened understanding of the importance of those capabilities, authorities, and practices that enable institutional agility. For eight years we've asked that our men and women on the front lines innovate and adapt under fire. They've done so. The QDR argues that the Department of Defense as a whole must do the same. We look forward to working with other departments and agencies and with Congress on these and other important cross-cutting issues.

### **Assessing and Managing Risk**

As this Committee knows all too well, defense strategy is more than simply articulating a framework and recommending ways to spend resources—real strategy requires making real choices. There is no such thing as a risk-free defense strategy—the challenge is to move beyond the question of *whether* to take risk, and determine *how* to manage risk over time in a way that favors success in today's wars, and enables our forces to prepare for potential future challenges.

Early in the QDR and in the course of the process of completing DoD's budget submission for FY 2010, the Secretary—together with Admiral Mullen—took action to direct resources away from lower-priority programs and activities so that more pressing needs could be addressed, both within that budget and in the years that follow it. Those decisions included ending production of the F-22 fighter, restructuring the procurement of the DDG-1000 destroyer and the Army's Future Combat Systems programs, deferring production of new maritime prepositioning ships, stretching out the procurement of a new class of aircraft carrier, and substantially reducing the Air Force's older fourth-generation fighter aircraft.

In addition to these steps, DoD is proposing in its budget submission for FY 2011 to conclude production of the C-17 airlift aircraft, having completed procurement of those aircraft. DoD has also decided to delay the command ship replacement (LCC) program and to extend the life of existing command ships, cancel the CG(X) cruiser, and terminate the Net Enabled Command and Control program. Those actions, among others, have enabled the Department to redirect resources into the high-priority mission areas outlined above.

These choices may not be popular, but in our view they are necessary in order to enable the Department to redirect resources into those high-priority areas described in the QDR—addressing capability gaps that are critical to better enable success in today’s wars while also better preparing for tomorrow’s challenges.

### **Beyond the QDR**

Mr. Chairman, the QDR report and the preceding months of deliberation served two purposes: first, to establish the Department’s key priority objectives, providing strategic context and recommendations on key capability development and investment priorities; and second, to communicate the Secretary’s intent for the next several years of the Department’s work. The QDR serves as a capstone institutional document, shaping how the Department of Defense will support America’s military personnel today, while building the policy and programmatic foundation that will enable the next generation to protect the American people and advance their interests. In this way, we believe that the 2010 QDR will serve to further rebalance and reform the Department of Defense to meet the challenges of a complex world.