

Posture Statement of  
Admiral Michael G. Mullen, USN  
Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff  
Before the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress  
Senate Appropriation Committee--Defense

Chairman Inouye, Senator Cochran, distinguished members of the Committee; it is my privilege to report on the posture of the United States Armed Forces.

I begin by thanking you for your support of our servicemen and women, their families, and the communities that do so much to help them. We can never repay them for their sacrifices, but we can support them. As leaders, we necessarily debate the best course of action to secure our nation in a dangerous world. But our servicemen and women do not hesitate. When the decision is made, they go where they are needed most, where dangers must be confronted and adversaries defeated. I'm humbled as I visit them around the world, defending our nation in very trying conditions. They care deeply for this country, and they care most that they have the nation's clear backing. The support of the Congress and the American people remain essential to their strength and resolve. I am grateful for your unwavering recognition of the service of our forces and their families.

Today's Armed Forces are battle-hardened, capable, and ready to accomplish the nation's missions. They are the most combat experienced yet most compassionate force we have ever fielded, and continue to learn and adapt in ways that are truly remarkable. They are the best I have ever seen. I thank the Committee for taking the time to understand the stresses, strains and concerns of our service members. Your continuing legislative support of our Armed Forces makes all the difference.

## **Key Developments**

Over this past year, our wartime focus has shifted to Afghanistan and Pakistan. As I have testified before the Congress on many occasions, the threats to our national security from al Qaeda and affiliated movements based in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region remain real and persistent. We require a stable and reasonably secure Afghanistan and Pakistan - inhospitable to al Qaeda's senior leadership, capable of self defense against internal extremist threats, and contributors to regional stability.

Our increasing focus on Afghanistan and Pakistan confirmed the border region to be al Qaeda's center of gravity. It also showed the situation to be more dire than previously understood. The Afghan-Taliban's post-2005 resurgence produced a widespread paramilitary, shadow government and extra-judicial presence in a majority of Afghanistan's 34 provinces. The Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan (the Pakistan Taliban) showed itself to be a bold and audacious enemy of the Pakistani people, ruthlessly seizing control of Swat in the late spring of 2009 and conducting a brutal series of attacks across the nation in recent months. Multiple Pakistani military operations against the Taliban that began last year have reversed their territorial gains. Throughout this year, we have constantly and carefully reviewed our objectives for the region. The decision to authorize an additional 21,500 American forces into Afghanistan in early 2009, followed by the President's commitment of 30,000 additional forces in December set conditions to reverse Afghan-Taliban gains. It will also enable the government of Afghanistan to build the security and governance necessary to eliminate the insurgency as a threat. With a new leadership team, appropriate resources, improved organization, and a better strategy, we are confident of success against al Qaeda and the Taliban. Success will not come easily or swiftly, but we will succeed. The hardest work to achieve our regional aims remains ahead of us, especially the last part of 2010 and into 2011.

Al Qaeda's central leadership has suffered significant losses over the past several years, to include the likely death of one of their founders, Sheik Sa'id al-Masri. Though its operational capacity has declined, al Qaeda's senior leaders remain committed to catastrophic terrorist attacks against the U.S. and our allies, as evidenced by the intended attack against New York City that was disrupted in Denver and the recent failed attempt to detonate a vehicle-borne bomb in Times Square. Actions in the Pakistan-Afghanistan border area, in Iraq, and elsewhere have met with marked success. That said, al Qaeda sought new approaches to plot attacks. The failed Christmas Day airline bombing attempt over Detroit was crafted by and ordered from those in Yemen's growing safe havens. Both incidents demonstrate the resolve of al Qaeda and its ever-evolving strategy. While the danger remains real, like-minded governments and people around the world — including those in the Muslim community — increasingly reject al Qaeda, its affiliates and what they stand for. Most want a brighter future for their children and grandchildren, not al Qaeda's endless war and intolerance. They see daily evidence that al Qaeda and its affiliates deliberately target and kill thousands of innocent Muslims in cold blood. They know al Qaeda continues a ruthless and deadly campaign against innocent people in Iraq, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Saudi Arabia, Kenya, Indonesia, and elsewhere. Continued progress against violent extremism will require enhanced, but prudent, partnerships with key governments and movements, including consistent efforts to counter al Qaeda's bankrupt message.

The actions of the Iranian government are of grave and growing concern. Tehran's leadership remains on a trajectory to acquire a nuclear capability—an issue of global concern—in defiance of international demands and despite widespread condemnation. Iran's government continues to support international terrorist organizations, and pursues a coercive and confrontational foreign policy. These efforts exist alongside growing divisions between elements of the government and between the government and the

people. These events and conditions risk further destabilizing an already unstable region.

Established threats also demonstrated they could flare at any moment, testing our resolve and dedication to long-standing allies. North Korea's violation of the Armistice Agreement by sinking of a Republic of Korea corvette illustrates the dangerous nature of that still on-going conflict. We must be ready to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with free countries and face down aggression when the situation demands it.

The unpredictable has also galvanized our military, requiring a significant force commitment in Haiti, making it one of our most significant humanitarian missions in history. Nearly 20,000 American troops deployed to support the Government of Haiti, the United Nations, USAID and over twenty American and international aid agencies from January through the late spring. From port openings, to security and distribution of supplies, U.S. Southern Command's military Joint Task Force performed admirably. Furthermore, your military was called on to help contain one of the worst environmental disasters in the history of the United States. From aircraft moving personnel and equipment as well as spraying dispersant, to imagery, sonar and communication support, the Department of Defense has provided whatever equipment and technology has been requested. Over 1,500 National Guardsmen are currently assisting with the oil spill, and the Administration has authorized up to 17,500 National Guard troops from Gulf Coast states to respond as needed.

Several recent policy initiatives have provided the military with new direction. We concluded negotiations with Russia for a START follow-on treaty, which will reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles while maintaining U.S. deterrence. As I have testified, I strongly endorse this treaty and ask you to ratify it. We also completed the Nuclear Posture Review, with significant implications for the military's nuclear posture. And, as mandated by the

Congress, we have reviewed current and future threats and developed appropriate strategies in the Quadrennial Defense Review, which supports the President's recently released National Security Strategy. This Security Strategy rightly sharpens our focus on countering weapons of mass destruction and proliferation of such weapons, particularly to terrorist groups. Achieving all the goals of these new policy initiatives will require improvement in both our conventional and nuclear forces. We look forward to working with the Congress to forge a common understanding of the threats our nation faces, and how best to counter them.

Recent events have reminded us of the importance of sustaining strong alliances. Our NATO allies and other non-NATO partners expanded support in Afghanistan over the past year. We now work there with more than 40 countries and over 40,000 international troops. Although the world avoided a widespread economic depression in 2009, many of our partners remain financially challenged and may spend less on combined security and stabilization efforts. Our close alliance with Japan, in particular, suffered strain around basing rights in Okinawa, but we seek to move forward with them in implementing a plan. The recent DPRK torpedo attack reinforced the importance of a robust U.S. military presence on the Korean Peninsula and in the broader region. As we stand by our close allies, I am confident that we can work through these issues, but it is a reminder that we should neither take our strongest allies for granted, nor underestimate the persistent tensions and threats.

Against this backdrop, the strategic priorities for the military remain unchanged from my last annual testimony before Congress: defending our interests in the broader Middle East and South/Central Asia; ensuring the health of the Force, and balancing global strategic risk. With your ongoing help and support, we continue to address each of these priorities.

## **Defend our Interests in the Broader Middle East and South / Central Asia**

The Broader Middle East and South / Central Asia, remains the most dangerous region of the world.

Our main effort within the region has changed. The government of Iraq is taking firm control of its own security. We have shifted our priority to Afghanistan and Pakistan, long under-resourced in many ways. That shift in focus includes the movement of some quarter of a million troops and their equipment in and out of the CENTCOM theater in the space of several months. This is a herculean logistics effort, but one we are successfully executing. Afghanistan is approaching parity with Iraq for the first time since 2003 as the location with the most deployed American forces.

Despite this surge, the security situation in both Afghanistan and Pakistan remains serious. The Afghan-Taliban have established shadow governments – featuring parallel judicial, taxation and local security/intimidation systems — in a majority of Afghanistan’s 34 provinces. Attacks by the Taliban have become far more numerous and more sophisticated. We are now establishing conditions — with military forces and expanded civilian agency presence — to reverse the Taliban’s momentum. Yet we face both a resilient Taliban insurgency and an Afghan public skeptical of their government’s good will, capacity and capability.

As of mid-June 2010, we have moved roughly 20,000 troops to Afghanistan, with the remainder of the 30,000 increase arriving as rapidly as possible over the summer and early fall, making a major contribution to reversing Taliban momentum this year. The remainder of these forces will join some 90,000 U.S. forces and more than 40,000 Coalition forces already in Afghanistan — all of which have undertaken a fundamental shift in *how* they are being employed across the country. Our troops are now focused on protecting key population centers — separating them from the intimidation and

influence of the Taliban. Simultaneously, they are training and partnering with Afghan security forces to enable Afghans to assume lead security for their own country as soon as possible. The recent peace jirga was an important Afghan-led step in this process. The next 12 months must be the time to reverse insurgent momentum and assess partnership progress.

The brave men and women we charge to implement this fundamental shift in Afghanistan security strategy need the strong support of this Congress. We need your assistance in key areas like funding for Afghan National Security Forces, who will ultimately bring about success and security. In the short term, the Commander's Emergency Response Program is needed to adequately protect the population, and enhanced special construction authorities and equipment procurement accounts will be critical to putting enough force on the ground to make a difference.

The border area between Pakistan and Afghanistan is the epicenter of global terrorism. This is where al Qaeda plans terrorist attacks against the U.S. and our partners — and from where the Taliban leadership targets coalition troops in Afghanistan. Pakistan's ongoing military operations against extremists in these areas are critical to preventing al Qaeda and associated groups from gaining ground.

In Pakistan, the extremist threat, a fractious political system, economic weakness and long-standing tensions with India continue to threaten stability. We are working to rebuild our relationship with Pakistan and re-establish trust lost between our two countries. We aim to demonstrate to Pakistan — in both our words and our actions — that we desire a long-term relationship. The recent Strategic Dialogue with Pakistan, hosted by the State Department and supported by the Defense Department, reflects the value both our countries place on the friendship and support of the other. Our recent concerns with Pakistan's approach to U.S. visa requests is further testimony to the challenges of the relationship; and, it will affect increased capacity for counterterrorism

and counterinsurgency, to include support for development projects. The State Department's Pakistan Counterinsurgency Capability Fund and the DOD's Coalition Support Funds allocated for Pakistan are essential components of our support to this critical ally. Enhanced contact and engagement between Pakistan and the United States is a critical component of a maturing, long-term partnership. Thus, we are focusing on expanded military education exchange programs, joint training opportunities and especially Foreign Military Sales and Foreign Military Financing. The State Department budget requests additional funds for these critical partnership endeavors.

South Asian security tensions and political dynamics significantly impact our objectives in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The longstanding animosity and mistrust between Pakistan and India complicates regional efforts. Yet India and Pakistan must both be our partners for the long term. Bilateral military relationships are an essential component in a wide array of cooperative activities. We must recognize this and address it as part of our policy. While we acknowledge the sovereign right of India and Pakistan to pursue their own foreign policies, we must demonstrate our desire for continued and long-term partnership with each, and offer our help to improve confidence and understanding between them in a manner that builds long-term stability across the wider region of South Asia. As part of our long-term regional approach, we should welcome all steps these important nations take to revive a process to resolve their differences over Kashmir.

While Afghanistan and Pakistan remain the critical terrain, we must remain vigilant in denying al Qaeda unfettered physical safe havens elsewhere across the Broader Middle East and South Asia, including Northern and Eastern Africa. These efforts will not require tens of thousands of American troops. Instead, we can work quietly and persistently with regional allies and Coalition partners to deny al Qaeda territory from which to plot, train, and project global terror operations. Similarly, we continue to undertake

collaborative, supporting efforts with like-minded governments across the broader Middle East. We work to help the Yemeni government build the information base and the military capacity necessary to combat the al Qaeda threat within its borders. We applaud Yemeni efforts to confront al Qaeda operatives, and continue to offer Sana'a the support necessary to achieve this aim. We have worked with the concerned neighbors of Somalia to contain the worst aims and objectives of the Islamic Courts Union and al Shabaab. This must continue. In these areas – as well as others including Indonesia and the Philippines – our military engages with willing partners in a manner detrimental to al Qaeda's aspirations. We undertake these partnerships in conjunction with those from American intelligence, diplomatic and economic organizations. I must stress that in today's environment, training and equipping partner security forces to defend and protect their own territory and coastal waters is a core national security objective. We appreciate Congress' continuing support for these important undertakings.

The Iranian government continues to be a destabilizing force in the region. Tehran's leadership remains on a trajectory to acquire a nuclear capability, in defiance of its international obligations. Indeed, the United Nations just declared Iran had sufficient fissile material to build two nuclear devices. A nuclear Iran could spark a regional arms race or worse. It will be profoundly destabilizing to the region, with far-ranging consequences that we cannot fully predict. Tehran also continues to provide a range of support to militant organizations, including HAMAS and Hizbollah, fomenting instability outside its borders. Its increasingly reckless nuclear and foreign policy agenda is now playing out against the backdrop of a slowing economy and profound internal turmoil. I remain convinced that exhaustive — and if necessary coercive — diplomacy with Iran remains the preferred path to prevent these grave outcomes. Iran faces an increasingly clear choice – cooperate with the international community or face consequences. To this extent, the Joint Chiefs, Combatant Commanders, and I support all efforts to steer the

government of Iran off of its hazardous course. However, as with any potential threats to our national security, we will have military options ready for the President, should he call for them.

Iraq continues to progress, although more is needed. U.S. partnership with Iraqi security forces has been fundamental to this progress since 2005. Al Qaeda is still present and has carried out several large-scale attacks. Iraqi Security Forces and government leaders responded to them vigorously yet professionally. Further, the Iraqi people show no renewed appetite for the brutal tactics of Al Qaeda; I believe Iraqis are now more focused on developing their economy than domestic security threats. Politically, the March 2010 elections were assessed as legitimate and were largely free of violence. Though the government transition has been drawn out beyond our original planning assumptions, there has been no degradation in the security situation.

In turn, U.S. Forces – Iraq (USF-I) will draw down to roughly 50,000 and end our combat mission by August 31, 2010, as highlighted by our recent turnover of the Green Zone to the Iraqi government. Our security partnership will then shift to training, advising, and supporting Iraqi security forces, including continued participation in NATO's Training Mission-Iraq. More broadly, the U.S. military will transition from a supported to a supporting effort in Iraq as we normalize relations. The State Department and other civilian agencies will increasingly be the face of U.S. efforts in Iraq. The U.S. military will strongly support their leadership. We appreciate the inclusion of the Equipment Transfer Provision in the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act. These transfers are a critical component of America's continuing actions as a reliable partner in Iraq's assumption of a responsible and Baghdad-led security future.

## **Health of the Force**

Our nation's security is founded upon a well-trained, well-equipped all volunteer force. We must care for our people and their families, reset and reconstitute our weapon systems, and take on new initiatives that increase wartime effectiveness.

### Care for our People

Our servicemen and women, their families, and their communities are the bedrock of our Armed Forces. Their health, resilience and well-being are at the heart of every decision I make. Frankly, investing in our people remains the single greatest guarantee of a strong military. Competitive pay, selective bonuses, expanded access to mental health care, continued health benefits for tens of thousands of our Wounded Warriors—those with seen and unseen wounds—and their families are critical to this investment.

Our military families and communities continue to play a unique and growing role in our national security fabric, one not seen in more than a generation. They support us and sustain us in ways we do not yet fully understand. They deserve the admiration and support of a grateful nation. My conversations with spouses and children around the world tell me these concerns center on caring for those affected by these wars, child care, education, health and employment issues.

We remain competitive in attracting the country's best talent. For the first time in the history of the All Volunteer Force, the Active Duty, Guard and Reserve components all exceeded annual recruiting goals for 2009. This success was reflected in the quality of our recruits as well as their numbers. Ninety-six percent of our accessions earned a high school diploma or better. Each Service also met or exceeded its 2009 retention goals. Our ability to recruit and retain underscores the fact that this is the best military I have seen in my 42-year career. While competitive pay is a critical factor in this success,

it does not stand alone. Other critical ‘people’ programs supported by the Congress – like the new GI Bill, adequate housing, access to quality schooling for military children, adequate child care, and attractive family support centers – come together to make the harsh burdens of military life acceptable.

We must not forget the challenges that this excellent All Volunteer Force faces every day. More than eight years of wartime operations have come at a cost. Most Army brigade combat teams are preparing for their fourth major deployment since 9/11, with some of them preparing for their fifth -- unprecedented in our history. The Marines Corps is in the same boat—their deployments are shorter but more frequent, and their pace is grueling. Our people spend less time at home, and this shorter dwell time between deployments does not allow for respite or for training along the entire spectrum of military operations. Our irregular warfare expertise—hard won over the last eight and a half years—has come at a price. Conventional war fighting skills have atrophied and will require attention. Yet this overdue attention will have to wait. The gains we anticipate from the coming draw-down in Iraq will be absorbed by our necessary efforts in Afghanistan for at least two more years. Resetting the force requires significant effort and sustained commitment now and post-conflict. We will continue to rely heavily on our Navy and our Air Force.

Dwell time—the ratio of time deployed to time home—remains a concern, and one we must manage closely this year and into 2011. Dwell time for the Army is at 1:1.2 and the Marine Corps is slightly better at 1:1.5. We will not see significant dwell time improvements across all services until 2012. Deployment rates for Special Operations Forces (SOF) and other low-density, high-demand specialties also remain very high. While our force is strong and resilient, these trends cannot continue indefinitely.

The challenges remain significant, but are manageable thanks to the support of Congress for increased end-strengths in the Army and Marine

Corps. We are only now starting to feel the positive impact from these 2007-authorized increases in the baseline force — stabilizing deployment rates and dwell times. Coupled with the additional temporary increase of 22,000 troops within the Army, Congressional support for our wartime military manning needs has been critical.

The stresses of protracted war extend beyond the deployments themselves. Our number of dead and wounded continues to rise, as does the strain on their families and their communities. Other social costs of war—divorce, domestic violence, depression, and post-traumatic stress syndrome—are unacceptably high and continue to increase. We have much more to do.

Suicide deserves special attention. Despite our best efforts, 2009 witnessed a record level of suicides, with increases in both the Active and Reserve components. We have not begun to study suicides among family members and dependents. While there is not one cause for increased service-member suicides, we know enough to be certain that better prevention training programs for leadership, for at-risk service members, and robust funding and attention toward sober study of the problem are absolutely necessary.

We should provide a lifetime of support to our veterans. I urge you to continue funding the programs supporting those that have sacrificed so much, including those aimed to reduce veteran homelessness and that focus on rural health care options. The demands on our active and veterans care services will continue to grow, and require the attention found in this budget. Yet we must conceive of Wounded Warrior Support in a manner that goes beyond the traditional institutions. Public, private, and individual sources of help represent a “sea of goodwill” towards our veterans. Our focus must be more on commitment than compensation; and more attuned to transition and ability than upon disability. Our veterans want the opportunity to continue to serve, and we should enable that opportunity.

## Reset and Reconstitute

My concerns about the health of our force go beyond our people. Our systems and capabilities are under extraordinary stress as well. The high pace of operations is consuming our capital equipment much faster than programmed. The Air Force and Navy have been essentially performing non-stop, global operations for 19 years, since Operation Desert Storm. The Army and Marine Corps have had the majority of their combat forces and equipment in the combat theater of operations for nearly six years. The unforgiving terrain of Afghanistan and Iraq causes extensive wear and tear, especially on our ground vehicles, helicopters, and supporting gear.

The demands of the current fight mean we must increase capacity in several areas, including rotary wing, ISR, electronic warfare and SOF. We sustain necessary rotary wing capacity through the addition of two active Army Combat Aviation Brigades, continued production of the tilt-rotor V-22, as well as our helicopter force, and a seventh SOF helicopter company. I support this budget's rebalancing in favor of more commercial airborne ISR capabilities for Combatant Commanders. This budget continues increasing the number of unmanned combat air patrols, coupled with the ability to fully exploit the intelligence coming from these platforms. We should expand current technologies to fill electronic warfare shortfalls and develop next-generation technologies for manned and unmanned aircraft.

## New initiatives

Too many of our processes and programs remain geared to a peacetime clock, but several new initiatives focused on supporting our war efforts show promise. I strongly support the Afghanistan/Pakistan Hands program and ongoing initiatives that increase the number and skill of our civil affairs and psychological operations personnel. I also strongly back the USAF's initiative

to use light aircraft for enhanced capacity building of key allies and partners for light mobility and attack.

Our current acquisition process remains too unwieldy and unresponsive. Adding 20,000 more acquisition experts by 2015 will help, as will increasing the rigor and efficiency of our internal processes. Stability in our programs, comprehensive design reviews, better cost estimates, more mature technology and increased competition will make the process more responsive. Once fielded, our systems are the finest in the world, because of the experienced and capable program managers and engineers building them. We need more of managers and engineers, and they need better support and leadership.

Finally, I am growing concerned about our defense industrial base, particularly in ship building and space. As fiscal pressures increase, our ability to build future weapon systems will be impacted by decreasing modernization budgets as well as mergers and acquisitions. We properly focus now on near-term reset requirements. However, we may face an eroding ability to produce and support advanced technology systems. Left unchecked, this trend would impact war fighting readiness. The Department, our industry leaders, and the Congress need to begin considering how to equip and sustain the military we require after our contemporary wars come to an end.

### **Balancing Global Strategic Risk**

Balancing global risk requires sustained attention to resetting the force. It also means making prudent investments to meet the challenges of an increasingly complex and challenging worldwide security environment. As the President recently noted, it is the United States that has helped underwrite global security with the blood of our citizens and the strength of our military. America's interests are global, and our military must secure these interests. Where possible, we will act first to prevent or deter conflict. When necessary,

we will defeat our enemies. And whenever able, we will work in concert with our many allies and partners.

For many decades, but especially since 1989, U.S. conventional overmatch has guaranteed our security and prosperity, as well as that of our many allies and partners. We have helped protect expanding global commons. We have seen the likelihood of conventional war between states drop. And we have used the tools designed for war not against human adversaries, but instead to support humanitarian operations. Most recently in Haiti, but elsewhere over the past 60 years, the military's unmatched capacity to transport goods and services have provided relief in the face of tragic natural disasters. In short, many nations have benefited from an extraordinarily capable and ready U.S. military, even as we have defended our own interests.

That capability must continue to span the full range of military operations. But in this post-Cold War era – one without a military near-peer competitor – we should not be surprised that adversaries will choose asymmetric means to confront us. They will seek to use both old and new technology in innovative ways to defeat our advantages. Terrorism will remain the primary tactic of choice for actors to conduct warfare “on the cheap”. Both state and non-state actors will seek weapons of mass destruction through proliferation. Increasingly, states will attempt to deny our ability to operate in key regions, through the development and proliferation of ballistic missile systems, or by exploiting space and cyberspace. Taken together, these are diverse threats that require a broad set of means.

Winning our current wars means investment in our hard won irregular warfare expertise. That core competency must be institutionalized and supported in the coming years. However, we must also stay balanced and maintain our advantage in the conventional arena. In the air, this advantage requires sufficient strike aircraft and munitions capable of assuring air superiority and holding difficult targets at risk. At sea, we require sustained

presence and capacity supported by a robust ship building program. On the ground, we must accelerate the modernization of our combat brigades and regiments. Without question, these are expensive undertakings. But our present security challenges demand them.

While maintaining our conventional edge, we also must address the safety and surety of our nuclear forces, even as we seek to reduce them. Our Nuclear Posture Review provides the guidance and vision on how to accomplish this laudable and historic goal. We must invest in our nuclear infrastructure and modernization programs in order to ensure our smaller nuclear force is safe, secure, and reliable.

Countering weapons of mass destruction means investing in new research, securing nuclear materials, and preparing a layered defense. Improving our ability to neutralize and render safe critical targets is vital. We maintain the ability to respond to their use against our citizens. But while improving responsiveness to the use of such weapons is critical, it is more important to counter their proliferation and deter their use. I advocate diverse investments in nuclear forensics and expanding our biological threat program, in addition to continuing investment in the highly effective counter-proliferation programs that are central to our success in this critical endeavor. These relatively small funds will have a disproportionately large positive impact on our security.

The ability of potential adversaries to challenge our freedom of movement and the peaceful use of the global commons has grown in recent years. Anti access-technologies and capabilities are proliferating, which could prevent us from deterring conflict in some regions. We must preserve our ability to gain access even when political, geographical or operational factors try to deny us the same. This requires funding for improvements to our missile defense capabilities, expanded long range and prompt global strike systems, and hardened forward bases.

Threats in cyberspace are increasing faster than our ability to adequately defend against them. Cyber attacks can cripple critical infrastructure, impose significant costs, and undermine operational capabilities. Meanwhile, space-based systems critical to our global awareness and connectivity are aging and have proven vulnerable. A determined enemy could degrade existing space systems, significantly impacting our strategic intelligence and warning capabilities, as well as global positioning and communication. I welcome your support for the recently stood-up U.S. Cyber-Command (CYBERCOM) and its associated funding.

Rising states present both a strategic challenges as well as strategic opportunities. China's economic strength, military capability, and global influence continue to grow. While our military relations continue to develop, we seek much more openness and transparency from China regarding the pace and scope of its conventional and nuclear force modernization. We also believe that China can — and should — accept greater responsibility for and partner more willingly to safeguard global prosperity and security. We are looking to China to join us in reacting to the Cheonan sinking in ways that make clear to North Korea that its aggressive behavior is unacceptable. We seek for Beijing to work more collaboratively when determining fair access to transportation corridors and natural resources. China also should demonstrate greater clarity in its military investments. Absent a more forthcoming China in these critical areas, our military forces must prudently consider and plan based on known Chinese capabilities and actions, in addition to its stated intentions. As we work with Beijing to establish a continuous military-to-military dialogue to reconcile uncertainties and generate confidence, we will pursue common interests in agreed upon areas such as counter-piracy, counter-proliferation, search and rescue, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. As a Pacific Rim nation with longstanding interests throughout the area, we will continue to play a vigorous regional role.

Our present dialogue with Russia is multi-faceted. It acknowledges points of contention as well as opportunities to “reset” our relationship on a positive trajectory. We welcome Moscow’s cooperation in reducing the number and role of strategic nuclear weapons. These discussions have been constructive, and I believe the resulting treaty will benefit the United States, Russia, and the world. Moscow has also helped us establish a supplemental logistics distribution line into Afghanistan. Russia also helped our diplomats pressure Iran, and we look toward Moscow to do even more in this process. On the other hand, Russia continues to reassert a special sphere of influence with its neighbors. The Russian military is simultaneously modernizing its strategic forces and many conventional forces.

North Korea continues to present a security challenge in Asia, as evidenced by the recent sinking of a Republic of Korea corvette. Today, Pyongyang continues to pursue intercontinental ballistic missile technologies, develop nuclear technologies, and export weapons in contravention of international norms on nonproliferation, and of two United Nations Security Council resolutions. It also maintains an unfortunate and threatening posture toward our ally the Republic of Korea, and an unhelpful disposition toward our ally Japan.

Of course, we can best defend our interests and maintain global order when we partner with like-minded nations. By forging close military-to-military relations with an expanding number of nations - providing training, equipment, advice, and education - we increase the number of states that are interested and capable of partnering with us. While tending to long-term allies, we should also cultivate our relationships with other liked-minded powers around the world. Making a small investment now will pay dividends in reducing our security burden and global risk.

We must also continue to work with our traditional Allies. NATO remains the most successful alliance in history, and our NATO Allies serve side

by side with us in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Our obligations under Article 5 remain clear, and our commitment to defending against threats—wherever they may originate—to our security and that of our Allies is unwavering.

We need full funding of Defense Theater Security Cooperation programs, and the many security assistance programs managed by the Department of State, particularly the International Military Education and Training program. Preventative strategies require providing foreign partners with the capacity to promote stability and counter-terrorism. With your help, we have made considerable strides in adapting our tools for security force assistance, but more is needed. I urge your continued support of the Global Train and Equip initiatives (under 1206 authorities) as well as funding for special operations to combat terrorism (under 1208 authorities).

The majority of threats facing the U.S. require integrated interagency and international initiatives. Supporting interagency cooperation programs, to include expanding the number of exchanges between the Department of Defense and other Executive Agencies, will improve interagency capacity to meet future security threats as well. Please urge your colleagues who oversee the Department of State to fully fund Secretary Clinton's requests. I ask the Congress to promote legislation that increases the expeditionary capacity of non-military Executive Agencies. Our future security concerns require a whole of government effort, not just a military one.

## **Conclusion**

This past year witnessed significant achievements by America's men and women in uniform. Their efforts and sacrifices - as part of a learning and adapting organization - have sustained us through more than eight years of continuous war. Thanks to them we are in position to finish well in Iraq. Thanks to them, we can begin to turn the corner in Afghanistan and Pakistan. In conjunction with our many partner nations, they've provided humanitarian

relief assistance to millions, helped contain a threatening H1N1 pandemic, expanded support to national law enforcement for enhanced border security, and disrupted terrorist sanctuaries world-wide. And, thanks to them, we have a global presence protecting our national security and prosperity.

The demands of the present remain high, and our military role in national security remains substantial. This will continue for the foreseeable future. Yet as I have testified before this body in past appearances, the military serves America best when we support, rather than lead United States foreign policy.

On behalf of all men and women under arms, I wish to thank the Congress for your unwavering support for our troops in the field, their families at home, and our efforts to rebalance and reform the force to assure that we win the wars we are in and are poised to win those we are most likely to face in the future.