

The Quadrennial Defense Review

TESTIMONY

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Andrew F. Krepinevich

Executive Director

Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments

March 14, 2006

Introduction

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before you today, and to share my views on the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). My testimony is intended to provide a context within which one might evaluate the results of this defense review.

The QDR is charged with looking out twenty years into the future. Twenty years from now, we should be able to look back and find that the recent QDR represented the most important and far-reaching review of our military posture since the early days of the Cold War. The reasons for this are clear. Consider that since the last QDR in 2001, the United States has:

- Seen New York and Washington attacked by radical Islamists;
- Invaded and occupied Afghanistan and Iraq, and waged an ongoing counterinsurgency in both of those countries;
- Initiated what stands to be a protracted “Global War on Terrorism” with radical Islamists;
- Witnessed the continued drift toward a “Nuclear Asia,” with the prospect that, by decade’s end, America will confront a 5,000-mile “Atomic Arc of Instability” stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Sea of Japan; and
- Observed the continued growth of Chinese military capabilities along disturbing lines.

To meet the demands of its charter, the QDR must address four main issues:

- Does it clearly present the major challenges that may plausibly confront the United States over the next 20 years?
- Does it present a strategy for meeting these challenges?
- Given the resources requested by the administration, is the strategy adequately funded?
- Are the force structure and defense program proposed by the Defense Department consistent with the diagnosis of the threat and the strategy proposed for addressing it?

Four Issues

The balance of my testimony focuses on these four issues.

I. Did the QDR identify the major existing and emerging challenges to America’s security?

Overview

The report gets high marks here. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld has concluded that no current or prospective enemy is foolhardy enough to take on the US military directly—tank against tank,

fighter jet against fighter jet. Rather, he argues, the threat is assuming different forms. Radical Islamist movements employ terror and subversion, and seek weapons of mass destruction to cause widespread damage. Hostile and potentially unstable countries like North Korea and Iran seek nuclear arsenals to intimidate American allies and threaten our military's ability to protect vital national interests. While China is not an enemy, it is developing a set of military capabilities it calls the "assassin's mace"—emphasizing ballistic missiles, information warfare, anti-satellite weaponry, submarines and high-speed cruise missiles—capabilities clearly designed to threaten US access to the "global commons" of space, the infosphere and the oceans, and intimidate America's allies and friends in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan.

Radical Islamists

The first, and most obvious long-term challenge, is that posed by radical Islamists. Today the United States does not confront a war against terrorism. Terrorism is a form of war, not an enemy. Rather, the United States is at war with radical Islam, and the Defense Department's adoption of the term "Long War" represents an improvement over "Global War on Terrorism." Radical Islamists are employing terrorism as it is the only form of warfare available to them at the moment, just as an insurgent movement employs terrorism as its principal means of war while it seeks to gain strength for more ambitious forms of military operations. Radical Islamists constitute a transnational, theologically based insurgent movement seeking to overthrow regimes in the Islamic world that are friendly toward the United States, and to evict US presence from parts of the world viewed as vital to America's interests.

Aside from its transnational character and theological roots, this insurgency differs from most in that its leaders seek to employ advanced technology—in the form of telecommunications for coordination, and weapons of mass destruction—to cause maximum destruction. The radical Islamists' global network, their lack of respect for the laws of war and the lives of innocents, combined with their apparent willingness to employ weapons of mass destruction and disruption, should they acquire them, makes this insurgency especially threatening. Radical Islamists have exploited elements of globalization, to include financial networks, the internet and increasingly porous borders, to form a network whose reach is global. Moreover, insurgencies and wars of religion tend to be protracted affairs and, particularly in the case of religious wars, often bloody as well. The roots of this insurgency run deep. No one should be under the illusion that this war will be won quickly, or that the price of victory will be cheap. As with most insurgencies, victory rests less in military action than in the successful treatment of political, economic and social ills, and in winning the "war of ideas" against those advancing a perverse and dangerous distortion of the Islamic faith. But victory will take years and perhaps decades to achieve. In the interim, the military's job is to buy the time needed for these other elements of counterinsurgency to succeed.

Nuclear Proliferation

The second major, enduring challenge to US security is the spread of nuclear weapons to unstable and/or hostile states in Asia. Since 1998, India and Pakistan have tested nuclear weapons and created nuclear arsenals. North Korea apparently has nuclear weapons and is

producing the fissile material necessary to fabricate more of these devices.¹ Iran, no doubt aware of the very different treatment accorded North Korea by the United States relative to a non-nuclear Iraq, is pressing forward vigorously with its nuclear weapons program. It is conceivable that before the decade is out, a solid front of nuclear armed states will stretch from the Persian Gulf to the Sea of Japan, running through Iran, Pakistan, India, China and North Korea, with Russia looming from above—a five-thousand mile “atomic arc of instability” in a part of the world which has become increasingly important to US security and economic well-being.

These states may not view nuclear weapons in the same way that the United States’ political leadership has come to view them over the years; i.e., as weapons of last resort, to be used only under the most extreme circumstances. In particular, it is far from certain that Iran, North Korea and Pakistan, whose cultures are quite distinct from that of the United States, and whose regimes are either unstable or unremittingly hostile (or both), view the role of nuclear weapons in this way.

The acquisition of nuclear weapons by hostile rogue regimes also threatens to disrupt the military balance. All things being equal, the United States’ willingness to project power against nuclear-armed adversaries would likely be much more constrained than against those who do not possess them. Washington may be compelled to alter its war aims when confronted by rogue states armed with nuclear weapons (e.g., abandoning the objective of regime change).² This seems to be a principal motive for North Korea and Iran to acquire nuclear weapons. If they succeed, it will reduce substantially, and perhaps precipitously, US freedom of action in two regions of vital interest. It may also make it far more difficult to deal effectively with ambiguous forms of aggression, such as Iran’s support for terrorism and for the insurgency in Iraq, or potential North Korean trafficking in fissile materials.³

The proliferation of nuclear-armed states also increases the likelihood that these weapons will be used. Again, it is not clear that they will be viewed as weapons of last resort, or that the regimes possessing them will take the kinds of precautions to secure them against unauthorized use that the mature nuclear powers put into place over the years. Owing to the relative instability of states like Iran, North Korea, and Pakistan when compared to the mature nuclear powers, it is conceivable that these weapons could fall into the hands of nonstate entities, either as a consequence of corruption (e.g., the unauthorized sale of a nuclear weapon to a nonstate entity), or state failure (e.g., possession by a faction in a civil war; seizure by radical Islamists). Nor can

¹ David E. Sanger, “North Korea Says it Now Possesses Nuclear Arsenal,” *New York Times*, April 24, 2003.

² It is fair to ask whether the United States would strike a nuclear-armed state under *any* circumstances. However, during the Cold War the US military had plans to attack its nuclear superpower rival, the Soviet Union, with nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. It is possible to envision plausible scenarios, to include those involving regime change, when a nuclear-armed adversary would be subjected to the full range of US military capabilities. For instance, were North Korea to employ nuclear weapons, or execute attacks that resulted in mass casualties (e.g., a chemical or biological attack on Seoul), the United States might consider regime change operations to be necessary.

³ In the case of Iran and North Korea, there also exists the possibility that the regimes in power will, at some point, either collapse or be overthrown. Should this occur, a period of chaos may ensue. If so, the security of those countries’ nuclear arsenals could be at risk.

one discount the possibility that a state like North Korea, which proliferates ballistic missile technology, or Pakistan, whose prime nuclear scientist was running a nuclear weapons production materials bazaar, would consciously provide, for a price, nuclear weapons or fissile material to other states, or even nonstate groups.

To put it bluntly, the United States is now in an era that might be characterized as a “Second Nuclear Regime,” with the First Regime, which began in 1945 with the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, having passed into history. That earlier regime was defined by two principal elements: first, a few, “mature” great powers possessing nuclear weapons, with all but China having a common European cultural orientation. Second, during that period, which lasted until the early 1990s, there developed a strong tradition of non-use of these weapons. Now the former characteristic no longer holds, while the latter is open to debate.

We might expand the Second Nuclear regime’s definition to include state and nonstate actors possessing biological weapons. By all accounts, biological weapons are becoming progressively easier to fabricate—certainly far easier than nuclear weapons—and, under the right conditions, can produce the mass casualties, economic disruption and terror associated with a nuclear strike. Yet little has been done to restrict the knowledge associated with developing biological weapons, and the infrastructure costs for producing them are quite modest when compared to those associated with nuclear weapons.⁴ For nonstate entities, this combination of comparatively low cost and high destructive potential may make the pursuit of biological weapons irresistible.

China

The third enduring challenge the United States confronts is the rise of China to great regional power status and, perhaps, over time to global power status. To date, discussions about the disposition of China often describe it as either a threat that must be addressed along the lines of the Soviet Union, or as a state that simply needs to be engaged and brought more fully into the global economy to ensure it will remain a member in good standing of the international community.⁵

The truth probably lies somewhere in between these gloomy and rosy poles. China does not represent the type of threat posed by the Soviet Union. For example, unlike Soviet Russia, China is not wedded to an aggressive, expansionist ideology. However, this does not mean that China will not pose challenges to the United States. Rather, if it does, they are likely to be advanced in different forms, employing different means. For example, whereas the United States had no significant commercial relationship with the Soviet Union, it has an enormous economic relationship (and trade deficit) with China. Moreover, both the United States and China may

⁴ Steven M. Kosiak, *Homeland Security, Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction: A Diagnostic Assessment* (Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, 2003), pp. 47-56.

⁵ See, for example, Aaron L. Friedberg, “Ripe for Rivalry: Prospects for Peace in a Multipolar Asia,” *International Security*, Winter 1993/1994, pp. 5-33; David C. Kang, “Getting Asia Wrong: The Need for New Analytical Frameworks,” *International Security*, Spring 2003, pp. 57-85; and Amitav Acharya, “Will Asia’s Past be its Future?” *International Security*, Winter 2004, pp. 149-164.

have important common security interests in the area of limiting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and combating radical Islamists. Should this prove to be the case, a more appropriate analogy might be the alliance formed by Great Britain and the Soviet Union in the wake of Germany's invasion of the USSR in June 1941. Britain, which had been at war with Germany for two years prior, quickly embraced Stalinist Russia as an ally, despite their many mutual antagonisms.⁶

On the other hand, China could emerge as a major threat to US security in the manner of Germany against Britain a century ago. Like Germany in the late 19th and early 20th century, China is a rapidly rising power. China is also beset by questions of political legitimacy; growing ecological problems; an economy that has enjoyed remarkable growth, but which may be entering a more mature period characterized by slower growth; potentially serious demographic problems that could induce societal instability; a rapidly growing dependence on foreign energy supplies; and outstanding security issues in the form of Taiwan, the Spratley Islands, Tibet, and perhaps portions of the Russian Far East. This could lead to friction between Washington and Beijing, especially if the other two major threats to international peace and stability cited above are slow to mature.

China presents problems for US forces quite different in some respects from those posed by US adversaries in other post-Cold War conflicts. For instance, the scale of military effort that China can generate far exceeds that of any rogue state. China's anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) capabilities are far more mature than any potential US rival.⁷ China's enormous size (it is the world's fourth largest country) also provides it with great strategic depth, a problem US defense planners have not had to address since the Cold War.

There is also some evidence that China seeks to displace the United States as the principal military power in East Asia, and to establish itself as the region's hegemonic power.⁸ If this were to occur naturally, stemming from the evolution of Chinese economic power and a corresponding increase in influence, the United States would probably accept such an outcome. However, if Chinese preeminence were achieved through coercion or aggression, this would serve neither US interests in the region, nor the stability of the international system and rule of law.

The challenge, then, for the United States is to encourage China to cooperate in areas where the two states have common security interests, and to convince Beijing that the resolution of its

⁶ Conversely, radical Islamists or nuclear-armed rogue states might preoccupy the United States far more than China. If so, the latter might be tempted to exploit this preoccupation by engaging in military operations that would jeopardize US security interests (e.g., coercion of Taiwan). An example here is the Soviet Union's use of the 1956 Suez Crisis to reassert, by force, its control over Hungary.

⁷ A combination of asymmetric capabilities sometimes referred to as "Assassin's Mace," comprise the core of China's A2/AD threat. Among these capabilities are advanced air defenses, information operations, ballistic and cruise missiles, and underwater systems (e.g., submarines) and munitions (e.g., anti-ship mines). See Michael Pillsbury, "China's Military Strategy Toward the U.S.: A View From Open Sources," *U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission*, Commission Contracted Research Paper, November 2, 2001, available at http://www.uscc.gov/researchpapers/2000_2003/pdfs/strat.pdf.

⁸ Aaron L. Friedberg, "The Struggle for Mastery in Asia," *Commentary*, November 2000, pp. 17-26.

outstanding geopolitical issues should be accomplished within accepted international legal norms. This means creating and maintaining a military balance in East Asia that is favorable to the United States and its allies against those kinds of contingencies that might tempt Chinese efforts at coercion or aggression. Since, for a variety of reasons, China is unlikely to challenge the US military symmetrically, the US defense planner's challenge will be to adapt its forces to confront more novel forms of Chinese military power.

II. Did the QDR present a strategy for meeting these challenges?

Here the QDR's record is mixed.

The QDR offers a reasonably clear picture of how the Department of Defense intends to prosecute the war in which it is now engaged—the war against radical Islamists.

The approach is generally proactive and aggressive, reflecting a belief that the defense in depth of the US homeland is best assured by engaging the enemy as far from US shores as possible, and keeping up the pressure on such groups so they have little time to organize and plan future attacks, let alone carry them out.

The military strategy envisions US forces, in combination with those of friends and allies, working to break down radical Islamist terrorist cells within friendly states. The US military will also endeavor to maintain surveillance over failed and ungovernable areas, along with the capability to act quickly in the event that terrorist cells are identified. Hence the QDR places emphasis on highly distributed special operations forces, either working in tandem with similar indigenous or allied forces to defeat terrorist groups, or prepared to act quickly on their own if such help is not available. It also emphasizes building and leveraging partner capacity as a way of expanding the capability needed to defeat radical Islamists, especially those waging insurgencies, such as those in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The QDR is somewhat less clear how it plans to deal with China, which is euphemistically described as a country at a “strategic crossroads.” The report notes that China is developing a worrisome set of military capabilities.

China is likely to continue making large investments in high-end, asymmetric military capabilities, emphasizing electronic and cyber-warfare; counter-space operations; ballistic and cruise missiles; advanced integrated air defense systems; next generation torpedoes; advanced submarines; strategic nuclear strike from modern, sophisticated land- and sea-based systems; and theater unmanned aerial vehicles for employment by the Chinese military and for global export.⁹

The QDR asserts that the Defense Department will pursue investments that “preserve US freedom of action” and “provide future Presidents with an expanded set of options” for

⁹ Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review Report*, February 6, 2006, pp. 29-30. Hereafter cited as “QDR.”

addressing the potential Chinese threat.¹⁰ But how might China use these capabilities to threaten US security interests and freedom of action? And how will US investments enable the military to dissuade, deter or defend against such efforts? For example, it seems likely that the Defense Department's decision to accelerate the development of a new long-range strike aircraft is intended to convince the Chinese that they cannot use their country's strategic depth to create a sanctuary of sorts for key military capabilities (e.g., ballistic missiles, land-based anti-satellite systems, command and control centers, etc.). But this is speculation. It would be useful to have the Pentagon's perspective as to how the interaction of the Chinese and US capabilities discussed will preserve stability in the Far East. This would be extremely useful in enabling Congress to make informed judgments regarding the Defense Department's force posture and investment priorities.

The QDR is even less clear as to how the United States will address the problem associated with nuclear rogue states, or the failure of nuclear-armed states. For example, the QDR states that

[T]he United States must be prepared to deter attacks; located, tag and track WMD materials; act in cases where a state that possesses WMD loses control of its weapons, especially nuclear devices; detect WMD across all domains . . . and eliminate WMD materials in peacetime, during combat, and after conflicts.¹¹

[T]he United States must be prepared to respond . . . [and] employ force if necessary, . . . [to include] WMD elimination operations that locate, characterize, secure, disable and/or destroy a state or non-state actor's WMD capabilities and programs in a hostile or uncertain environment.¹²

It is unclear as to *how* the US military will accomplish these missions, which are not hypothetical problems that may arise at some point in the distant future. They are *today's* challenges. Consider, for example, that the QDR candidly concedes that detecting fissile materials and rendering safe WMD devices (e.g., a nuclear weapon) are "particularly difficult operational and technical challenges."¹³ Even collecting reliable intelligence on WMD programs and activities is judged "extremely difficult."¹⁴ But it offers little insight as to how the US will address the WMD problem if these challenges cannot (as it seems likely) be overcome in the foreseeable future. Nor does the QDR invest much in the way of resources to address this problem.

Indeed, at present there appears to be little confidence that the United States can conduct preventive attacks to disarm North Korea or Iran of their nuclear materials production facilities,

¹⁰ QDR, p. 31.

¹¹ QDR, pp. 33-34.

¹² QDR, p. 34.

¹³ QDR, p. 34.

¹⁴ QDR, p. 33.

or that it can quickly identify and secure the weapons in the event of a nuclear state failure (e.g., Pakistan). Given the difficulties associated with taking preventive action against a country developing nuclear weapons, or of detecting, tracking and intercepting those weapons in transit, the US military may have to default to the unsatisfactory option of attempting to deter enemies from using WMD. However, this may be risky, as the United States has little understanding of the cost-benefit calculus of states like Iran and North Korea, let alone nonstate entities like al Qaeda, which seeks to acquire such weapons.

In the end, the QDR fails to provide a sense of how the Defense Department will address this admittedly difficult challenge.

III. Is the defense program adequately funded?

It is not. The QDR calls for a large-scale modernization effort in the coming years, the first in over two decades. Yet it also proposes to reduce defense spending toward the end of this decade, in part by holding down spending on personnel, even though recent increases in benefits have failed to stem the decline in the quality of recruits entering the Army. To be sure, some personnel cuts are planned, and a few small programs will be cancelled, but the tough choices were deferred, raising doubts whether the existing defense program could be executed, let alone one including initiatives to address the new and emerging challenges to US security. Independent estimates conclude that over the long term the defense program may be short some \$50 billion a year, a shortfall that will prove difficult to erase given the administration's plans to cut the deficit in half by 2009.

IV. How well does the proposed defense program address the existing and emerging threats to national security?

Not nearly as well as it could, or should. The saying "Show me your budget priorities and I'll show you your strategy" may be somewhat hyperbolic, but it contains a strong element of truth. Given the magnitude of the changes witnessed over the last four years, and with the prospect of more to come, one would expect major changes in our military forces and equipment. Yet despite Secretary Rumsfeld's guidance, the QDR leaves US forces equipped primarily for traditional warfare. Among its top priorities:

- The Army's Future Combat System, projected to cost nearly \$150 billion, was conceived to exploit information technologies to defeat enemy tank forces at a distance—but none of our existing or prospective enemies are building a new version of Saddam Hussein's Republican Guard armored force.
- The Navy's DD(X) destroyer, at roughly \$4 billion a copy, is a firepower platform. Yet the naval challenge from China, if it comes, will be centered on its submarine force, a threat against which the DD(X) is irrelevant.
- The Pentagon's F-35 fighter program is by far the most expensive program in the defense budget, at over \$250 billion. The fighters are designed to sweep enemy aircraft from the skies and strike targets on the ground. But al Qaeda has no air force, and the most

worrisome strike systems being fielded by China, North Korea and Iran are ballistic missiles, not fighter aircraft.

- The Marine Corps' V-22 aircraft, designed to hover like a helicopter and fly like a plane, has become so expensive that it cannot be built in large numbers. Meanwhile, the Corps' aging helicopter fleet the V-22 is designed to replace is wearing out at an alarming rate, owing to the high pace of operations in Iraq.

The Pentagon's unwillingness to scale back these programs, or in some cases terminate them, will allow them to generate "program momentum." As they consume ever more funding, their constituencies in the military, Congress and the defense industry will grow. Consequently, other QDR initiatives that might enable our military to meet new threats risk being starved of funding in their infancy. Among the most promising:

- A one-third increase in the number of Special Forces battalions, our most heavily deployed units in the war against radical Islamists.
- A new long-range strike aircraft designed to loiter for protracted periods over the battlefield, whether searching for terrorists targets in remote areas or missile launchers deep inside Iran or China.
- Programs and forces to cope with the problem of detecting, tracking and disabling weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons that enemies might attempt to smuggle into the United States.
- Medical countermeasures against bio-terror threats. Here the Pentagon is adding \$1.5 billion over five years to the effort—less than half the cost of a single DD(X) destroyer.
- Modernizing our air tanker refueling fleet to replace aging aircraft that date back to the 1950s. These aircraft have been in great demand since the Cold War's end. Their ability to refuel our reconnaissance and strike aircraft in flight helps in the effort to maintain something approximating an "unblinking" eye over the battlefield to search and engage high-value targets like terrorist leaders, "loose nukes" or mobile missile launchers armed with weapons of mass destruction.
- Increasing our submarine production to send a clear signal to China, and our allies, that Beijing cannot expect to threaten US freedom of action in an area of vital interest, or coerce America's friends and allies in East Asia.

Which set of capabilities best reflects the QDR's assessment of the principal challenges before us? Which would be most useful in tracking terrorists in remote areas of Africa and Central Asia? Dealing with a destabilized Pakistan or Saudi Arabia—al Qaeda's two principal targets? Thwarting radical Islamist attempts to smuggle a nuclear weapon into the United States? Conducting persistent extended searches for North Korean nuclear-tipped missiles emerging from their caves to launch an attack? Deflecting the efforts of China's submarines, ten years hence, to threaten our Navy's ability to defend Taiwan from coercion or aggression? Clearly it is

the infant initiatives spawned by the QDR, which cost but a fraction of the legacy programs whose principal focus is on traditional forms of warfare that the QDR rightly notes are of progressively less relevance.

Yet most of these worthy initiatives are under-funded, or not yet funded at all. Other promising programs, such as creating an “advisory corps” to train other militaries in the war against radical Islamists, have been sacrificed altogether. In a case of “robbing Peter to pay Paul,” the Army has had to scale back its force modularity plans in order to divert soldiers into the Special Forces. While the effort to increase our SOF capability is laudable, scaling back Army force structure given its current deployment rates seems unwise.

Conclusion

The QDR performs a great service in identifying security challenges that in some cases are very different from the planning metrics that shaped much of the defense program since the Cold War’s end. In so doing, the QDR enables some first-order decisions or adjustments to some main elements of the defense posture:

- The Army and Marine Corps need to reorient themselves on *irregular challenges* to our security, with principal emphasis on capabilities associated with foreign military assistance, special operations, counterinsurgency, counter-terror “manhunting,” and human intelligence.
- The Air Force and Navy need to reorient themselves on existing and prospective *disruptive challenges*, (i.e., China) placing primary emphasis on countering emerging anti-access/area-denial capabilities, and threats to the global commons (e.g., space, the infosphere; offshore undersea economic assets such as the global fiber optic grid and energy fields; and maritime commerce).
- It seems likely that the four Services have important roles to play in addressing direct, *catastrophic threats* to the American homeland. These include defense against ballistic and cruise missile attack; border control; defense against delivery of WMD through nontraditional means (e.g., capabilities for identifying, tagging and tracking these weapons); and consequence management.
- Military operations over the past 15 years have demonstrated that when our enemies challenge us in *traditional warfare*, as in the two Gulf Wars and in the Balkans, air power can play an increasingly important, if not dominant role. While all four Services should maintain a significant residual capability for traditional warfare, the Army and Marine Corps should be able to migrate more of their capabilities into other challenge areas than either the Air Force or the Navy.

In addition to rebalancing Service forces and capabilities to address irregular, catastrophic and disruptive challenges to U.S. security, the military needs to undertake key institutional changes. Among them are:

- Refocusing the professional military education (PME) system to emphasize the study of Asia in general, and radical Islam and China in particular. Irregular warfare is also in need of increased emphasis. The foreign area officer (FAO) program needs to be expanded and enhanced. Intelligence operations need to accord much greater emphasis on HUMINT than in the recent past. Finally, as officers needed to become “physics literate” after the advent of nuclear weapons, today they need to become “biosciences” literate owing to the prospect of biological weapons becoming available to hostile nonstate entities that may prove difficult, if not impossible, to deter.
- Transforming the training infrastructure to better account for irregular, catastrophic and disruptive challenges to US security.
- Restructuring the force to sustain sufficient forces engaged in a protracted conflict. The Navy and Marine Corps long ago established a rotation base for their forces. More recently, significant progress is being made in this area, with the Air Expeditionary Forces and the Army’s modularity initiative. However, these forces are primarily oriented on traditional challenges. More effort will be needed in areas where the QDR has made a down payment, such as increasing the Special Operations Forces, expanding the Army’s psychological warfare and civil affairs capabilities, and creating a robust Advisory Corps to build partner capacity in the Long War on radical Islamism.
- Developing a strategy for the defense industrial base that fosters innovation while addressing the possibility that, in future conflicts, US forces may suffer significant attrition of equipment, something that has not occurred since the Vietnam War.
- Reviewing the nation’s alliance portfolio. With the rise of threats to the national security that are greater in scale and broader in scope than those confronted in the first decade after the Cold War, the United States needs capable allies and partners far more than at any time since the Cold War—but for different types of missions, and in different parts of the world.
- Engaging relevant departments and agencies of the Executive Branch with the goal of developing more effective interagency relationships and relevant capabilities for dealing effectively with irregular and catastrophic challenges to US security.

I applaud the Committee’s determination to tackle this important issue. It is critically important that we seize this opportunity to position ourselves by crafting a strategy and force posture that can sustain us for what is likely to be a long struggle. Failure to accomplish this runs the risk that defense planners will invest increasingly scarce resources in capabilities optimized for the “wrong” future. Tragically, the Defense Department’s unwillingness to reduce or clear away the big-ticket programs that represent strategic “dead wood” will see them consume ever greater levels of funding in the coming years. The result will be that many of the QDR’s worthy infant initiatives will be stillborn, starved of funding by far less relevant programs kept on life support at a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars.

Having provided an accurate diagnosis of the new challenges confronting the nation, and made a modest down payment on addressing them, the Pentagon's leadership has passed on making the tough decisions needed to reorient the military. But tough choices must be made, for as Sir Francis Bacon noted: "He who will not apply new remedies must expect new evils."